DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 995 SP 020 099

AUTHOR Tanner, Laurel N., Ed.
TITLE Papers of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 71p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meetings of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (1st, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27, 1978, and 2nd, San Francisco, CA, April 8-9, 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM Professor Murry R. Nelson, College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Innovation; *Educational Practices; Educational Strategies; Educational Theories; Higher Education; Police Action; *Relevance (Education); Teacher Educators; Teaching Methods; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Counts (George S); *Curriculum Theories; Dewey (John); Federal Bureau of Investigation; Rugg (Harold Ordwell)

ABSTRACT

The 13 papers that comprise this collection were, with certain exceptions, presented at the first and second annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History. Papers by the society's members, who attempt to achieve more disciplined inquiry into the history of curriculum, include: (1) "What We Can Learn from Our Experiences with the Deweyan Tradition" (Arthur G. Wirth); (2) "Conceptualizing Method: A History" (Mary Louise Seguel); (3) "Educational Control for Crazy-Making: Notes Toward an Alternative" (Arthur G. Wirth); (4) "FBI Surveillance of Three Progressive Educators: Curricular Aspects" (Murry R. Nelson and H. Wells Singleton); (5) "The Progressive Malaise of Revisionist Historians--As Seen by a Progressive" (R. Freeman Butts); (6) "The Revisionist Historians and Educational Practice" (Hollis L. Caswell); (7) "The Revisionist Historians and Educational Theory" (J. Paul Leonard); (8) "Progressives and Revisionist History" (Paul C. Violas); (9) "Curriculum History: Flight to the Sidelines or Source of New Vitality?" (R. V. Bullough, Jr.); (10) "Conceptions of Curriculum History" (J. Stephen Hazlett); (11) "An Elusive Quarry: On the Trail of Curriculum History" (O. L. Davis, Jr. and George L. Mehaffy); (12) "Research into the Curriculum, 1918-1938: Highlights of the Work of the First Generation" (Kate Strickland); and (13) "Richmond and Berkeley: Paradigms for Curriculum Innovation at the Turn of the Century" (Murry R. Nelson and H. Wells Singleton). An introduction by the papers' editor, Laurel N. Tanner, gives brief overviews of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History and of the papers contained in this document. (CJ)

ED216995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PAPERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF CURRICULUM HISTORY

		PAGE
LAUREL N. TANNER	INTRODUCTION	1
ARTHUR G. WIRTH	WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM OUR EXPERIENCES WITH THE DEWEYAN TRADITION	3
MARY LOUISE SEGUEL	CONCEPTUALIZING METHOD: A HISTORY	6
ARTHUR G. WIRTH	EDUCATIONAL CONTROL FOR CRAZY-MAKING: NOTES TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE	14
MURRY R. NELSON AND H. WELLS SINGLETON	FBI SURVEILLANCE OF THREE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATORS: CURRICULAR ASPECTS	18
R. FREEMAN BUTTS	THE PROGRESSIVE MALAISE OF REVISIONIST HISTORIANS — AS SEEN BY A PROGRESSIVE	23
HOLLIS L. CASWELL	THE REVISIONIST HISTORIANS AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE	29
J. PAUL LEONARD	THE REVISIONIST HISTORIANS AND EDUCATIONAL THEORY	31
PAUL C. VIOLAS	PROGRESSIVES AND REVISIONIST HISTORY	34
R. V. BULLOUGH, JR.	CURRICULUM HISTORY: FLIGHT TO THE SIDELINES OR SOURCE OF NEW VITALITY?	39
J. STEPHEN HAZLETT	CONCEPTIONS OF CURRICULUM HISTORY	43
O. L. DAVIS, JR., AND GEORGE L. MEHAFFY	AN ELUSIVE QUARRY: ON THE TRAIL OF CURRICULUM HISTORY	47
KATE STRICKLAND	RESEARCH INTO THE CURRICULUM, 1918-1938: HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WORK OF THE FIRST GENERATION	51
MURRY R. NELSON AND H. WELLS SINGLETON	RICHMOND AND BERKELEY: PARADIGMS FOR CURRICULUM INNOVATION AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY	60

SP 020 099

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Murry Nelson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presidents of the Society

1978 - 80 Laurel M. Tanner
1980 - 81 O. L. Davis, Jr.
1981 - 82 Kate Strickland

Managing Editor
Edmund C. Short

assisted by
Murry R. Nelson

©Society for the Study of Curriculum History

Spring, 1981

The assistance of The Pennsylvania State University in the preparation of this publication is gratefully acknowledged.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Society: Professor Murry R. Nelson, College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

INTRODUCTION

The papers that comprise this collection were, with certain exceptions, presented at the First and Second Annual Meetings of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History. This first meeting was held on March 27, 1978, in Toronto and the second on April 8-9, 1979, in San Francisco.

A brief word should be devoted to the founding of the Society. In April, 1977, a group of educators gathered at Teachers College, Columbia University, to explore the possibility of forming an organization concerned with the study of the history of the curriculum. The problem that brought them together was the ahistorical and atheoretical character of curriculum reform efforts. Witness the open classroom movement which was a recycled version of an earlier educational movement, with all of the glaring mistakes of the earlier version. As Ralph W. Tyler pointed out in a letter to President Lawrence A. Cremin, who was the host for the gathering, those who work in curriculum development have an inadequate understanding of curriculum efforts in the past. The problem was recast by the meeting as the need to address pervasive educational problems from the vantage points of curriculum history. Since no other organization has this focus, the Society for the Study of Curriculum History was born. Its purpose is to generate good historical studies and to serve as a means of building on past experience with an ever-increasing effectiveness.

Fittingly, the Society was initiated at Teachers College, for if a place can be called the birthplace of the curriculum field, it would surely be Teachers College. More importantly, the Society represents the first organized effort toward more disciplined inquiry into the history of the curriculum.

It goes without saying that we cannot determine everything about the history of the curriculum. We have to decide what aspects are relevant to our present problems and interests, what questions we want answered rather than what information can be dredged up. With the exception of the papers by Professors Butts, Caswell, Leonard, and Violas, which were prepared for a symposium presented at the 1979 Annual Meeting of AERA jointly by the Society and Division B of AERA, the papers presented before the Society reflect a range of independent interests and concerns. Judging from their titles, they appear relatively unrelated. Yet there are certain common concerns that can be discerned. For example, both Professors Seguel and Wirth see the teacher as caught between two conflicting traditions -- progressivism and efforts to model schooling on the managerial-efficiency model. This is particularly intriguing because Seguel and Wirth started with such different research problems; Seguel with the decline of "the idea of method as residing in the teacher" (instead it is in the material), and Wirth with "What We Can Learn from Our Experience with the Deweyan Tradition." Wirth contends that what many educators have called Dewey's "curriculum vagueness" (his failure to furnish detailed pedagogical prescriptions) was not vagueness at all but fully consonant with Dewey's view of the teacher as a professional rather than a technician. Dewey believed that teachers must be "moved by their own intelligence" (pp. 27-28 in The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers, 1904). But the point is that no other position is conceivable for those who have an understanding of curriculum reform efforts in the past. Wirth's analysis of crazy-making institutions reflects a similar issue.

The conflicting traditions are to be found within progressivism itself, as Professor Butts points out in addressing the contention of revisionist historians that progressive education was conservative in intent and outcome. Butts is concerned with the "continuing conflict between the social-reform oriented progressives and the efficiency- oriented progressives," whom Butts calls conservatives. In Butts' view (and, I might add, in my own as well) revisionist historians who call for a curriculum confined to the "basic academic skills" are promoting a very conservative view of the curriculum. A curriculum denuded of values and divorced from the urgent social problems that face our society is a curriculum for social control.

A concern for academic freedom, one of the most difficult of our present problems, marks the papers of Professors Butts, Nelson and Singleton who write of the liberal educators who sought to bring the curriculum to bear on societal problems. Their papers deal directly with what liberal progressives like Counts, Rugg, Childs and Kilpatrick went through during the McCarthy era. "I assure you that we who worked in the curriculum field after the first World War did not sell our souls to the company store," writes Professor Leonard (whose "present" is considerably larger than that of revisionist historians). Professor Leonard sets forth the principles under which the curriculum leadership worked during the 1920's through the 1950's.

Professor Butts, Caswell and Leonard are the scholars and activists of the period under radical criticism. Their ideas on how they experienced curriculum reform are indispens-

able to a sound analysis of the conflicting points of view that exist in the present on their intentions and achievements. Professor Violas responds to their challenges to revisionist history from the perspective of the "challenged".

How did persons in the curriculum field go about confronting the problems they faced? It was this question that led Professor Bullough to undertake persons-centered history and his paper is concerned with the problems that he has found in this approach. Professor Kate Strickland examines efforts of curriculum research and, in historical perspective, suggests much is to be learned from reviewing and evaluating those efforts. The same question is approached differently by Professors Nelson and Singleton who use school surveys and reports to determine what city school districts did and why in curriculum development. As Professor Caswell writes in his paper, "there is an abundance of material to draw on. Curriculum materials of many types, illustrative teaching units, accounts of curriculum programs and the like were published by a large number of city and state school systems." And he cautions that without attention to these materials, no understanding of the kind of change sought by leadership in the field is possible. This problem is clearly recognized by Professor Hazlett, who points to the vast store of prescriptions, plans, and projects that curriculum historians have apparently chosen not to use because they feel that extant records are "insufficient." Hazlett finds the assumption to be untenable. "Lack of knowledge of the past is to a considerable extent the result of the simple failure to inquire," he tells us. Yet, there is a responsibility to continue to create source documents for use by later historians. Oral histories, says Professor O. L. Davis, is one such kind of document.

This set of papers does not constitute the complete proceedings of the 1978 and 1979 meetings of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History. Not included, for instance, are the panels on working with students in curriculum history. Professors Klohr, Jackson, Jorgenson, Ponder, Sloan, and Daniel Tanner all contributed invaluably with many fresh insights, and with characteristic energy and enthusiasm. The papers, here placed on public record, provide, I believe, a commenable beginning of a new era of scholarly work related to the study of curriculum history.

Laurel N. Tanner
Temple University
Editor

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM OUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE DEWEYAN TRADITION

Arthur G. Wirth
Washington University

It is no secret that we have had a love/hate relationship with the Deweyan part of our tradition. By reflecting on this phenomenon we may see something about American life which explains in part the bitterness of the debate over school programs -- a bitterness I believe we can expect to continue.

Daniel Bell has pointed to an underlying division in the society which gets reflected in debates over school policy. Bell says that there is a widening tension between the values of our economic, technical order which is oriented to functional rationality and organized on the principle of economizing — of least costs and optimization of production and profits, and a counter set of values concerned with wholeness of persons.[1] (Bell sees hedonism in the latter while I see it more as a reflection of the democratic insistence on treating persons as ends.)

This tension may sharpen as we approach decisions about social reconstruction involving shifts from preoccupations with quantitative growth to qualitative goals. If so, the real task will be, not to choose between wholeness vs. technocratic rationality, but to search for divergent solutions which bring together our best capacities for inquiry and intellectuality with the concerns of our democratic traditions for the quality of life. In this case Dewey, read correctly, I believe, might again have relevance for social and educational planning.

Two points of comment:

(1) The Deweyan tradition won't be of value if interpreted once again as a romantic educational freedom.
(2) It contains an image of learning and teaching at odds with another 20th century American innovation: the effort to subsume school learning under business efficiency ideology.

Can we learn anything from our previous affairs with Dewey? One thing is clear, when we permit Dewey to be interpreted as nothing but a romantic aberrant we deny ourselves access to a part of our past which might be helpful. The next time we lurch away from educational system building as dehumanizing, it would be nice if we could avoid a dismal rerun of Dewey cast as an apostle for a new round of "freedom for children."

We could insist on getting to the fore some of his own reminders on that point: a classic one being his 1902 statement in The Child and the Curriculum, that the history of education reveals two educational sects -- the one with the slogans of "the child and freedom" on its banner, the other marching under the flag of "subject matter and discipline." His conclusion being that this long-standing division points to the dilemma that legitimate values are represented in both camps. Dewey's view of the fundamental nature of education requires that he attach importance to both: He defines education as a matter of helping learners to reconstruct experience so they will see their world or themselves with new meanings. Learning is primarily a meaning--seeking affair. The studies, therefore, require careful respect because they contain meanings we need that have grown out of human inquiry. In How We Think (1910) Dewey said that the teacher had to be steeped in his subject: "Unless he has mastered the subject matter . . . and is thoroughly at home in it he will not be able to attend to the pupils' intellectual reactions"[2] and to open new insights to them. In "Progressive Education and the Science of Education" (1927) he said that the teacher as the person with "the riper and fuller experience and the greater insight into the possibilities of continuous development found in any project, has not only the right but the duty to suggest lines of (educative) activity."[3]

On the other hand he emphasized, over and over, that the locus of reconstructing experience was always in the life of the individual learner. This led him to assert in Democracy and Education that, "How one person's abilities compare in quantity with those of another is none of the teacher's business. It is irrelevant to his work. What is required is that every individual shall have opportunities to employ his own powers in activities that have meaning."[4]

This part of our tradition then tells us, contrary to the educational romantics, that we are in trouble whenever we fail to win kids to the life of the mind through engagement with the intellectual power of the disciplines; but we are in trouble, too, when we get lost in complicated measurement games instead of helping each kid to find his own power to learn -- to get in touch with his unique arete or excellence.

It is true, however, that people turning to Dewey have been confounded by his vagueness about curriculum. (John Childs once said that when Dewey approached the curriculum question

in Experience and Education, "He marched right up the hill and then right down again.") We might note that on occasion Dewey did urge teachers of progressive persuasion to accept "the necessity of finding projects which involve an orderly development and inter-connection of subject matter," and that they should work out, for trial and criticism, definite and organized bodies of knowledge.

I think this very way of putting it may shed light on "the curriculum vagueness" problem. It is rooted in a conception of the fundamental image of the teacher that is in marked contrast to the role of the teacher in the efficiency model.

In The Sources of a Science of Education, (1929)[5] Dewey said that the function of the scientific planning of education was not to supply the teachers with fixed objectives or ready-made rules but to provide whatever "enables the educator, whether administrator or teacher, to see and to think more clearly and deeply about whatever he is doing." "Education," he insisted, "is a mode of life and action" -- not an antiseptic delivery system. From this viewpoint there is no way to get kids to experience education as a meaning seeking way of life unless the teacher is experiencing that himself. There is no way you can combine this concept of education with teacher-proof packages nor with equating teacher efficiency with student performance on standardized test scores.

In both teacher-student relations and collegial relations it requires open communication and treating ideas about teaching as working hypotheses. If learning is to be inquiring for students, then teachers need freedom to be inquirers into the processes of their own work.

It will help to be candid about several consequences that follow from this conception:

(1) It is a lot more complex than romantic freedom. (We may note that there was curriculum design in Dewey's Lab School with a historical emphasis on the study of critical change points in the evolution of human experience -- including, for example, study of classical Greece and Rome.)

(2) It is a style that does not lend itself to mass educational engineering. Any such efforts will only pervert it. It is risky to make tries along these lines unless one is willing to create smaller learning communities, within larger systems, that assure teachers' initiative and integrity.

(3) It is an educational point of view with consequences for social philosophy.

In Reconstruction in Philosophy Dewey said, "All social institutions have a meaning, a purpose. That purpose is to set free and to develop the capacities of human individuals without respect to race, sex, class or economic status."[6] The test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements is the extent to which they educate every individual into the full stature of his possibility.

Dewey was clear that his concept of inquiry-centered, collaborative learning communities ultimately made social sense only if we made serious economic changes in the direction of industrial democracy with extensive worker participation.

This brings us back to the cultural split, described by Bell, between the drives for utilitarian, rational efficiency, and wholeness of persons. We recognize, of course, the parallel in education in the twentieth century split between progressivism and efforts to model schooling on the model of corporate business efficiency.

C. A. Bowers pointed out recently that the current concern for efficiency is manifesting itself powerfully in a sophisticated technocratic ideology rooted in the language and world view of systems analysis, which embraces the assumptions of the conservative managerial center of society. We recognize it in behavior modification, career education, and competency based education.[7]

This tradition takes for granted the values of the corporate status quo. It sees itself as concerned with a neutral goal of improving efficiency, defined as increased measurable output. It is a rationale rooted in Comtian positivism, bureaucratically channeled through decisions by experts. It tends to assume that only observable behavior is real, that anything real must be measurable, that significant learning consists of discrete components, and that the good self is operationally defined by scoring well on expert-designed tests. The individual is posited as a component in the system. His learning experiences are measured at various stages to determine the efficiency of the delivery system. As Bowers points out, this rationale makes no reference to the individual who experiences existence as problematic and it is hard to find in it the liberal concern for education as a rational emancipatory force.

Furthermore, the specialized systems vocabulary (performance objectives, sequencing instruction, pro-active decision making, discrepancy evaluation) begins to capture the way our minds think about education. We are subtly incorporated as supportive functionaries of the technocratic world view.

What can we foresee from this cultural split? The prospect is for continuing struggle within both the social and educational arenas. As long as the mainstream assumes that we can pursue quantitative "more" as if the supply of irreplaceable natural resources were limitless, the safe bet is on the side of the technocratic expansion. The lure of viewing education as a vehicle for place and consumerist advantage is taken as a self-evident good.

I personally, however, do not accept that this version of what America is about will go unchallenged. The ecological, social, and psychic costs are too heavy. We already are sharpening our awareness of critical new factors in our experience: an awareness of our planet's limited resources; an awareness that a more highly educated populace has new aspirations about life satisfactions and will not tolerate the trivialization of jobs that has pre-occupied scientific management; an awareness that urgent needs for sanity and personal growth move people to reject atomization and manipulation and to seek more integrated contact with their whole selves.

These yearnings call for a different type of rationality that breaks with the mechanistic traditions -- a rationality committed to helping establish symbiotic relations with nature and committed to the reconstruction of institutions in the interests of survival and health. If, for example, a more highly educated work force presses for redesign of work along the lines of industrial democracy, current systems analysis approaches in career education will be seen as dysfunctional.

In short, there just might be another round wherein the style of educational thought in the Deweyan tradition would deserve another look. If so, it would be a refreshing change to see it not misidentified once more with romantic freedom. An even happier prospect would be to avoid over-simplified either/or choices between our two traditions. But we also ought to face the fact that in choosing between the two we are talking about nothing less than what kinds of persons we want to become and what kind of future we want for this country.

A final note of realism. The majority of Americans, including many bluecollar workers, accept what Max Lerner called the values of a business civilization. Many endorse not only the material rewards but find personal satisfaction in the rough and tumble of the competitive corporate system. They welcome the embrace of the discipline of technocratic ideology by the schools and will resist alternative suggestions.

But we lack a general consensus; there are, in fact, deep seated doubts. Max Lerner, for example, noted how frequently civilizations have been weakened by a pathological insistence upon pushing to extremes their master institutions.[8] He thinks defensiveness about the business system may be vitiating qualities of democratic leadership "attuned at once to the life of nature and the life of the spirit." Robert Heilbroner detects "a hollowness at the center of a business civilization -- a hollowness from which the pursuit of material goods diverts our attention for a time, but that in the end insistently asserts itself."[9]

I do not need to point out to you the evidence of disaffection and psychic disarray. The clash between the disaffected and defenders of the status quo surfaced dramatically in the sixties. I believe the value issues opened then have not disappeared but will resurface as controversial issues for the rest of this century.

Dewey insisted that the alternative to rigid defensiveness of our master institutions was to explore seriously the meaning of democratic values for both our economic and educational institutions. It involves exploring how more people can live with a sense of empowered participation instead of accepting the role of functionaries in a meritocratic efficiency system. The issues have barely been joined. I expect it to be lively up ahead.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Daniel Bell, "Schools in a Communal Society," in L. Rubin, ed., The Future of America: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973), p. 44.

[2]John Dewey, How We Think, rev. ed., 1933. (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1910), pp. 274-275.

[3]John Dewey, "Progressive Education and the Science of Education," Progressive Education, July, 1928, V, p. 203.

[4]John Dewey, Democracy and Education. (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1916), p. 203.

[5]John Dewey, The Sources of a Science of Education. (New York: Horace Liverwright, 1929).

[6]John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy. (New York: New American Library, 1950), p. 147.

[7]C. A. Bowers, "Emergent Ideological Characteristics of Educational Policy," Teachers College Record, September, 1977, Vol 79, No. 1.

[8]Max Lerner, America as a Civilization. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), p. 947.

[9]Robert Heilbroner, Business Civilization in Decline. (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1976), pp. 112-113.

CONCEPTUALIZING METHOD: A HISTORY

Mary Louise Seguel
Northern Illinois University

Several years ago I became interested in method and how American educators have thought about it past and present. Method isn't a very widely used notion today. We are especially vague on the idea of method as residing in the teacher as a skilled professional. Instead we look for method as built into instructional materials and appropriate experiences. We appear to be bemused by the notion of the curriculum as a sort of holy ghost which will if properly invoked bring about desirable educational goals. The curriculum is to be mediated through instructional materials and learning experiences, and the teacher must learn how to help pupils complete these materials and undergo these experiences. If the teacher and pupils respond correctly to materials and experiences, they will together achieve the desired goals. The teacher is, of course, the professional assigned to invoke the curriculum. It can't properly be done by an unskilled person -- or at least the proper certification won't be issued if it is. There is even doubt on the part of some critics of the schools about the role of the teacher. They think the intervention of the teacher superfluous, and by implication suggest that the materials and experiences themselves are enough.

Faith in this process has a close resemblance to other faiths current in our culture; the standardized medical treatments for illnesses; the step-by-step procedure for putting together unfamiliar equipment like unassembled Big Wheels or lawn furniture; the books advertising ways to avoid probate, or get consumer satisfaction; the psychological adjustment manuals and standardized therapies. Lyman Bryson once remarked that in a developed technology a person who knows how to do something sells his knowledge, usually in printed form, and as a result Americans think anybody can learn anything. There is an ultimate development of this faith in the curriculum as the mediator of learning; programmed materials as methods of teaching!

Instructional materials today usually come into the school in the form of packages with brand names. They are sometimes christened with the publishers' name, often with the name of their current formulator. Witness the Peabody Language Kit, SRA Reading materials, the Fernald approach to reading, the linguistic approach to spelling, Frostig's perceptual approach, or Ausubel's advance organizer. Experiences are events arranged by the teacher in which the learner is intended to be totally immersed. Directions for arranging such experiences are legion and are found in texts, manuals, and even in special technical kits. They are often classified under subject matter headings such as reading, outdoor education, or social studies. As yet no one in the profession has made the attempt to identify basic methodological elements in either materials or experiences. There is no classification scheme of method as there is of objectives. Teachers use them eclectically.

Further, theorists are reluctant even to use the word method today. All sorts of substitute terms are in vogue. The current literature shows writers prefer such terms as technique, tactic, mode, procedure, style, design, learning module, model, instructional module, instructional plan, guidance of learning experience, teaching device, teaching practice, lesson, approach, teaching technology, methodological pattern, maneuver, and finally strategy.

Yet, as late as the thirties, method was still a widely used term in educational writing. Of 135 books I have examined which were classified as being about teaching (from Hall's Lectures on School-keeping in 1829 to Cooper's Classroom Teaching Skills in 1977), a third of them or 43 appeared in print in a 15 year period from 1920 to 1935. The contents of these books show that period to be the heyday of method treated explicitly. The National Conference on Educational Method was established in 1921 and it put out a Journal of Educational Method. By 1929 it had been accepted as a department in the NEA with a new name, Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction.

I was intrigued. How had method as a concept become eclipsed? In 1927 Harold Rugg foresaw this development when he pointed out that desirably the teacher should occupy the important place of guidance which the profession had regrettably given to the materials of instruction. He deplored this phenomenon but accepted it and put his faith in the curriculum rather than the teacher as the effective educational intermediary between child and society. But why?

In my search through the card catalogue I stumbled accidentally on hundreds of entries on method and technique in fields other than education. Bryson's prediction was fulfilled in the areas of engineering, crafts, industrial processes, agriculture, and the like. The entries on these methods continued to be large up through the present. Method in a technical field differs however from method in a social field like teaching. The material with which

the teacher works is unpredictable to a degree which cannot be well anticipated. The artist can know the nature of paint and canvas and how it will behave under certain conditions. The engineer can know the nature of steel. They can cut the unpredicatability of their materials to a minimum and the less unpredictability the greater the control. But teachers work with humans, whose behavior is predictable only within very broad limits. As a result the artist and engineer work with a technique. A technique is defined by Webster as a body of specialized procedures and methods used in any specific field. The teacher has only a method; a manner or mode of procedure, especially an orderly, logical or systematic way. The difference is subtle but lies in the difference between the material upon which each works. For the teacher, each method is much more of an adventure than for the engineer.

In spite of this difference, social engineering as a concept has caught the imagination of today's educational theorists. Bobbitt's initial formulation of the educational process in 1912 probably is responsible. He likened the development of a high type human being to the production of a quality steel rail and the power of that metaphor is still with us. Our faith in the right processes applied in the best sequence comes from that initial stage.

Histories of education are concerned with matters of greater social, political, and economic import than teaching method, so material is sketchy. I did a very hasty skimming over the history of method, touching down only on a very few outstanding peaks. I found that interesting methods, after being invented by talented educators, were usually put in practice in a school. An early method was Jesus' use of the parable. Socrates with his ironic and maiuetic modes strove to develop heuristic learning in his pupils. Catechism was the method of the early church, a memorized set of correct questions and correct answers. It was followed by the medieval use of disputation as a method of instruction, consisting of thesis, proof, objections, acceptance, or rejection. The Jesuits were among the first to record their use of emulation which followed the initial interpretation of the material by the teacher, and its repetition and discussion as supervised by monitors. Rousseau proposed a method which was essentially a lack of method; the child would be left completely without systematic intervention. Around the beginning of the 1800's the monitorial system was introduced in the United States. Pestalozzi by simplifying subject elements and grouping them psychologically sought an alphabet of every subject so that the pupil could pass from step to step in a uniform unvarying fashion. Froebel's method using his "gifts" was influential in kindergarten education in the 1870's. The American Herbartians introduced Herbart's five informal steps, an attempt to systematize the relationship between content to be learned and the development of child thought. Dewey formulated the problem-solving approach to teaching, and Kilpatrick elaborated it into the form he called the project. Related phenomena were the socialized recitation and unit organization developed and advocated by Morrison and Bagley. Helen Parkhurst with the Dalton plan and Carleton Washburne with the Winnetka plan inaugurated the contract system. Montessori methods introduced the notion of self-instruction as a result of the nature of the materials themselves. Programmed instruction was a logical outcome of earlier work on task analysis and developments in computer technology made possible programs which could be monitored by computers.

The Herbartians must be credited with having been the first to exercise important influence on American thought on method. Hall's and Page's books on school-keeping were typical of pre-Herbartian thought. Eschewing either stuffing learner's heads with rote information (pouring-in) or by passing them by the use of leading questions (a pseudo drawing-out) Page recommends waking up the learner's mind. He means stimulating the pupil's natural mental powers to work to their best capacity. The Herbartians would not have disagreed thus far. However, they pointed out that all materials were not equally apt for this waking up process. There must be selection and order in terms both of the nature of knowledge and of the orderly development of child thought. In 1892 DeGarmo urged educators to correspond the method in the subject at any stage to the stage of development in the child (DeGarmo, p. 5). He proposed an interesting pair of metaphors for the child's mind. Either it is a germ "containing by involution that which is to become by evolution," in which case the teacher is an educational gardener. Or the "mind at any given stage of its development is the resultant of the manifold forces of its environment, as a product more externally than internally produced," in which case the teacher is an educational architect (DeGarmo, p. 3). In the end, DeGarmo blends germs and scaffolding without realizing how awkward an image he invokes. That very incongruity was at the source of later difficulties in method and was to be resolved in various ways by later theorists. They were to find that they couldn't accommodate an organic image and a mechanical image in the same metaphor.

Although specific Herbartian methods such as the five formal steps did not continue to be influential, their methodological concerns did continue to shape thought on method. Charles McMurry's lifelong preoccupation was with what he called the central question, that is, "how much of concrete data (illustrative or descriptive, facts or objects, pictures, maps and diagrams) is required to bring out clearly the main organizing idea in the topic" (C. McMurry, 1914, pp. 36-37). Frank McMurry

was concerned that pupils acquire methods of thought appropriate to each bit of content. For instance, how should one think about a map? One should learn to estimate distances, and to use coordinates. Their concern for method, their interest in technique, the relationship of content to the pupil's developing mental powers, the structure of subject matter fields, all were methodological concerns which continued to be worked on by the profession.

The essentially static nature of the solutions the Herbartians proposed to the problem of method was transformed as Dewey and Parker began to urge what came later to be known as the problem-solving method and still later developed by Kilpatrick as the project method. Further outgrowth of this influence were the socialized recitation, unit planning and the contract. Melvin in 1932 makes an eloquent case for switching to them entirely and discarding the dependence on the older formulations of method.

"The problems of teaching technique are the problems of bridging the gap which exists between the child and the curriculum. . . . There was a time when the gap was bridged by beginning with the subject matter and building across toward the child, by using building materials of subject matter and attempting to fit them to the child's personality . . . consequently discussions of technique . . . were concerned with such things as subject matter, units of geography or history and their mastery, the development of prearranged lesson plans, the organization of subject matter into satisfactory lesson types in accordance with its essential structure, the suggestion of devices and artificial forms of awakening the interest of children in the subject matter. . . . The teacher committed to a more modern form of procedure . . . begins with the responses of the children. Picking these up as she finds them she . . . directs the learning process in such a way that the responses of the children link naturally, and with as little friction as possible, to the values of the curriculum . . . the discussions of newer techniques of teaching are less clean-cut and definite than those to which many are accustomed. . . . Lesson patterns being more intricate, they will be less adaptable to formal analysis and description in terms of types . . . the spirit of the new teaching, . . . proceeds, not by formula, but by an understanding, interpretation and direction of the specific case; not by rules, but by principles" (Melvin, 1932, pp. 65-67). Melvin goes on to say that the key to method is to realize that "the teacher is absolutely compelled to forget ideas, knowledge, and information and persuade his pupils to do something. This is the key to method. The teacher must somehow prevail upon his pupils to act. It is the pupil acting that will recast the subject matter and give it new life. . . . There is no side-stepping this process of self-identification of the learner with what he learns" (Melvin, 1952, p. 135). Melvin declares his faith that having the pupils act is sufficient. Whether they are holding a Thanksgiving party, making a wind machine, opening and operating a restaurant, making an illuminated text on the Middle Ages, taking an old car apart, or visiting a mining town, somehow out of these vigorous actions the teacher and student will distill systematic, sequential organized knowledge.

However, others felt that there was much valuable in Herbartian method and ways must be found to harmonize the older methodology with the newer ones. An example of this effort was the formulation in 1933 by Noble Lee Garrison of what he called the two phases of teaching. The first phase, the administrative activities of teaching, is a vehicle or way to carry on the second phase, teaching techniques. For example, the project method is an administrative activity. By means of first-hand experiences, pupil self-discovery of need and purpose, and pupil direction of activities, pupils will grow in the personal traits of independence and power in work. Not however if the teacher neglects teaching techniques such as problem-solving, drill and appreciation. Unless the teacher develops, refines, and improves the pupil's problem solving within a project by leading the pupil to clarify his ideas and draw better conclusions, then the administrative activity, or the project, is not sufficient to justify itself educationally. Garrison finds that the newer methods are all administrative activities; socialized recitations, supervised study, laboratory work, contracts, units, and projects.

Garrison's and Melvin's contrasting views illustrate a growing tension between two positions on method. One, influenced by the Herbartians, emphasized the primacy of ideas. The other, influenced by Dewey, emphasized the primacy of purposing. Neither position ignored the claims of the other. It was clearly a matter of emphasis. The believers in ideas recognized the need for learners to use knowledge to sense and solve problems. They didn't however want learners to miss knowledge just because it didn't happen to come up. They also felt that learners could follow imaginatively the initial formulation of ideas by original thinkers in their original settings. In this way they could see the connection of ideas with life problems. They were taken aback, many of them, by evidence that pupils taught through purposing were sometimes ignorant of large parts of the knowledge bank. They insisted that the store of ideas one has exerts a powerful influence on the sensing of a felt need. For example, conservation of resources in the interests of future generations is difficult to establish as a felt need, as long as there is still plenty today. To turn it into a felt need some ideas have to be well established, such as concepts of resource, production, consumption and the like.

The believers in pupil purposing recognized the need for knowledge in the solution of problems. They wanted learners to learn knowledge on the production line, so to speak. They trusted in the true problem solver to know when there was a problem, to know how to set about solving it, and in the process acquire the knowledge needed. Knowledge that wasn't needed, wasn't needed. Far too many ideas taught in the schools were irrelevant anyway, and the cultural milieu itself was a much richer and more suggestive source than traditional content.

Dewey himself proposed a resolution of this tension. He described method as basically cyclical. The problem solver first acquired psychologically organized knowledge as he solved his problem. As the child builds a rabbit cage he makes the length of boards equal by lining them up and thus he gains a crude notion of measurement. As the child is guided by the teacher he responds to these crude notions with new problems. He buys new lumber for a booth and must estimate how much to buy. He uses a standard measuring rule and becomes familiar with arbitrary standard units of measure. Again his knowledge is psychologically organized, but with a strong bias toward logically organized knowledge or the culture's funded knowledge of measurement. Eventually through a series of carefully guided problem-solving experiences, psychologically organized knowledge will become more and more like logically organized knowledge. Dewey called this process the progressive reorganization of subject matter and he insisted that it was a teaching method as well. Of course the teacher must possess a well-articulated stock of fundamental ideas which represent the funded logic of the race.

There was another notion lurking in Melvin's statement that would emerge later in Caswell's formulation of curriculum development. That was the suggestion that submitting the pupil to an experience was itself a method. As Caswell himself put it, "Experience is a process; it is the living through of actual situations. . . . Thus the process of experiencing, results in changes in an individual which are unities different from any of the elements which went to make up the experience" (Caswell & Campbell, 1935, p. 81). And he goes on to say, "Integrations of habits and knowledge which represents desired types of conduct can be developed only by guiding the child in situations which require such conduct . . . there is only one way to learn to be honest, and that is to be honest . . . and the chances increases that in all new situations he will exhibit the desired trait" (Caswell & Campbell, pp. 378-379). Although the initial concept by Caswell was that of experience, before long experience became learning experience.

Several influences served to move theorists farther away from a focus on method as a personal skill of the professional and toward method as a set of processes of a semi-autonomous character. One influence was the emphasis by Kilpatrick and others on the wider concept of method. To quote Frasier in 1924, "in the narrow sense method refers to the specific way of doing a specific thing." For instance, there is one way to build a house or one proper arrangement of the letters in spelling. He goes on to say, "The broad interpretation. . . takes into account all important factors related to the doing of the specific thing" (Frasier & Armentrout, 1924, p. 149). All enterprises must be planned. For example, a spelling conscience must be developed. Kilpatrick added that the pupil learns to like or dislike spelling as well, or perceives the gap between what teachers do and what they profess when they teach democratic ideals in an autocratically run classroom.

A second influence was the transformation of supervision from assessment and judgment based on personal teaching experiences to the application of a set of engineering criteria and procedures. Both teacher and supervisor could refer to them. The teacher became the manager of a process which was empty of any particular content but waiting to be filled. This method conceptualized the human product as being as brainless and non-unique as a steel rail. Eventually under Skinner's influence this view of method came much closer to social engineering.

A third emphasis was the subject matter specialist. Moving with the times he began to couch method in terms of learning experiences in special subject matter areas. Learning experiences often proved, however, to be other methods thinly disguised. Theorists first recommended drill in spelling as contributory to the clear expression of thought or the desired basic ideas. Later they discussd drill itself as a method and used examples from teaching spelling as illustrations of the virtue of drill. Finally theorists in the teaching of spelling itself used drill as one technique among many others to achieve the goal of producing good spellers.

Today, two parallel lines of development seem to be emerging in the field of method. One, a legacy of the earlier emphasis on the acquisition of basic knowledge makes its appearance in the form of packaged materials. Here solidified method represents the best engineering available in subject matter areas and the teacher is basically a manager of these processes. In many cases the procedures are very explicit. The title of a work, Methods that Teach, by McDonald (1965), gives a clue to the contemporary approach. Methods, frozen in this case into a set of step-by-step procedures, can be relied on to do the teaching. For teaching spelling a complete week's plan of procedure is offered, so detailed that it even includes a reminder to the teacher to remind the children to keep their spelling

books closed at the onset of the lesson until she tells them to open them. The plan shows the teacher, among other things, how to divide the group by means of an initial diagnostic test, how to set the fast spellers studying their words alone, and how to put the slow spellers through another step-by-step process; hear, see, pronounce, write, compare, check. The teacher is even shown how to test. It is assumed that if the teacher follows the steps, voila, the pupils will emerge knowing how to spell. Further, methods in individualized instruction frequently take the form of instructional units or "modules" which specify options for learners, or alternative ways to study the same topic. They are planned to enable the learner to concentrate on learning activities most appropriate to his learning style. For example, the teacher constructs or purchases units for each learning, calling them unipacs or learning modules.

The other is the legacy of the emphasis on pupil purposing. The methodological form is the experience, a gestalt which the pupil undergoes and from which, presumably, many outcomes emerge. The management of both materials and experiences by the teacher entails a number of related methods to enhance the management. For example, in a manual on classroom teaching skills, drill, recitation, review and lecture have been replaced by questioning, interpersonal communication, management, and observation skills. In another manual there is a good analysis of the factors related to method, such as assessing learning styles, learning disabilities and theories of learning. At this critical point the student is then assigned to "propose specific teaching learning techniques (including specific activities and experiences, methods, materials, personal relationships, etc.) which are appropriately suited to teaching learners with four different learning styles. Time: 25 minutes." The student need not worry, however, since he will probably teach in a school system which provides him with a whole panoply of Methods that Teach (Cooper, 1977).

Method is presented as the end result of an apparently complex set of factors to be kept in mind by the teacher. It is regarded as so highly personalized that there is little or no sense in attempting to discuss it directly. As one theorist puts it, "It is important to stress that no 'how' or methodology is correct or incorrect in itself. There is no one best way to teach! Validity of method is established only in relation to its effectiveness in accomplishing a specified learning objective." And that matter has already been taken care of by the purchase of proper learning materials.

Other theorists who are becoming critical of methods today are studying what actually goes on in classrooms. To replace anecdotal accounts or distillations of the experience of gifted practitioners, the researchers study the frequency of occurrence of certain psychological functions in classrooms. Schemes are devised to study the cumulative impact of certain patterns or combinations of patterns of functions. Since these functions are primarily psychological they do not provide a way of studying the substantive drift of method, or the logic used and the product aimed at. For example, Flanders concentrated on verbal behavior and conceptualized the dynamics of the classroom as the way in which one verbal act leads to another. His items were process items, however, conceptually empty bags, independent of content. The teacher might teach erroneous content and yet retain a good interaction pattern. One is reminded of the ladylike scorn with which Alice Zimmern, a Girton scholar at Cambridge, described the history teaching about England she observed on a visit to schools in New York City, in 1894. The textbook in use made the following observations, "We [in the United States] have no King John who can imprison us at his will, or smother innocent little boys. We have no Queen Elizabetn to dictate how we shall worship the ever-living and true God." She goes on to remark, "The absence of all dates leaves the impression on the reader's mind that King John, Henry the Eighth, are all alive at the present day, ready to torture or behead anyone who annoys them" (Zimmern, p. 70).

Current use of the term strategy deserve our attention, since it implies fresh attention to certain problems of method that have been neglected. Hyman has an excellent discussion of the probable reason for the use of the term. "The concept of a strategy is used in situations where the attainment of one's goal is blocked by someone or something . . . to overcome [this] a strategist maps out his plan of attack according to the strengths of his forces and his opponent's . . . the order and timing of his actions . . . retreating and regrouping actions . . . his opponent's possible behavior . . . a plan for the most efficient and quickest victory in light of his opponent's position and the prevailing general conditions." He points out that for these reasons the term strategy is used often in war, chess, tennis, basketball, politics, diplomacy, labor-management, and race relations. Should it be applied to teaching he asks? "There are specified goals to be attained in the classroom and a variety of means can be used to attain them. Furthermore, teachers and pupils often see each other as opponents, not only for leadership control of classroom activities, but also in a battle of wits related to the topic at hand" (Hyman, 1968, p. 390). He later adds that they may also be cooperating in a common struggle against a common enemy, perhaps lack of knowledge?

Some strategies recently elaborated show promise of returning to former emphases on the needed harmony between teaching method and the mental methods of the learner. Suchman offers

a step-by-step account, supported by tapes of actual protocols of his method, his basic metaphor being a commonly used parlor game, Twenty Questions (Suchman, 1961). Hilda Taba had a carefully worked out procedure on learnable, thus teachable, thought processes. Oliver and Shaver carefully describe both recitation teaching and Socratic-type teaching. And Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil have done the profession a real service to gather together in one volume, with extended commentary, a good number of outstanding current exemplars of explicit methodology (Joyce & Weil, 1972).

In the foregoing working paper I have attempted to explore some changes in the professional treatment of method -- particularly to contrast differences between the fifteen-year period 1920-1935 and today. I feel that I have only begun to investigate this important problem. It is my hope that we as a profession are developing a new interest in method, especially as it relates to the powerful position occupied by instructional materials today. It is my hope also that we will think seriously about the possibility of a taxonomy of method or basic teaching designs to match our currently available taxonomy of objectives.

REFERENCES

All books examined are included although a few of the books on teaching are elusive on the subject of method and technique. The references are alphabetical but a chronological arrangement will show the peaks of professional interest in teaching methods set forth in the paper.

Abraham, Willard. A Time for Teaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Adams, Jesse E. and William S. Taylor. An Introduction to Education and the Teaching Process. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Adams, John. Exposition and Illustration in Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

_____. Modern Developments in Educational Practice. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1922.

Almack, John Conrad and Albert R. Lang. The Beginning Teacher. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928.

Arnold, Sarah L. Waymarks for Teachers. New York: Silver Burdett, 1891.

Anderson, Robert H. Teaching in a World of Change. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966.

Avent, Joseph Emory. Beginning Teaching. Knoxville, Tennessee: The Author, 1926.

_____. Excellences and Errors in Teaching Methods. Knoxville, Tennessee: The Author, 1931.

Bagley, William Chandler. Craftsmanship in Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1911.

_____. The Educative Process. New York: Macmillan, 1905.

_____, and John A. H. Keith. An Introduction to Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Bain, Winifred E. An Analytical Study of Teaching in Nursery School, Kindergarten, and First Grade. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

Balassi, Sylvester J. Focus on Teaching. New York: Odyssey Press, 1968.

Bamberger, Florence E. Syllabus Guide for Observation of Demonstration Exercises. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938.

Barnett, P. A. Common Sense in Education and Teaching. New York: Longmans, Green, 1899.

Bayles, Ernest E. The Theory and Practice of Teaching. New York: Harper, 1950.

Bellack, Arno A. (ed.). Theory and Research in Teaching. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Betts, George Herbert. Classroom Method and Management. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1917.

Blackhurst, J. Herbert. Directed Observation and Supervised Teaching. Boston: Ginn, 1925.

Bolton, Frederick Elmer. Principles of Education. New York: Scribners, 1910.

Bottrell, Harold R. Introduction to Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1962.

Brembeck, Cole S. Discovery of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1962.

Bryan, Elmer Burritt. The Basis of Practical Teaching. New York: Silver Burdett, 1905.

Burton, William H. Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1944.

Cantor, Nathaniel. Teaching Learning Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953.

Caswell, Hollis L. and Doak S. Campbell. Curriculum Development. New York: American Book Company, 1935.

Chamberlain, Arthur Henry. Standards in Education. New York : American Book, 1908.

Charters, W. W. Methods of Teaching, rev. ed. Chicago: Row Peterson, 1912.

_____. Teaching the Common Branches. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.

Clark, Harold F. and Anne S. McKillop. An Introduction to Education. New York: Chartwell House, 1951.

Cole, Percival R. The Method and Technique of Teaching. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Colgrove, Chauncey P. The Teacher and the School. New York: Charles Scribners, 1910.

Colman, John E. The Master Teachers and the Art of Teaching. New York: Pitman, 1967.

Cooper, James M. (ed.). Classroom Teaching Skills. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1977.

Crawford, Claude C. and Louis P. Thorne and Fay Adams. Problems of Education. Los Angeles: The Author, 1938.

Davis, Sheldon Emmor. The Technique of Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

_____. The Work of the Teacher. New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Dearborn, Ned Harland. An Introduction of Teaching. New York: D. Appleton, 1925.

De Garmo, Charles. The Essentials of Method. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1892.

Dewey, John. The Child and the Curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1902.

Dinsmore, John Wirt. Teaching a District School. New York: American Book, 1908.

Drum, Warren Nevin. A Preview of Teaching. Boston: Ginn, 1928.

Earhart, Lida B. Types of Teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1915.

Flanders, Ned A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Fleming, C. M. Teaching: A Psychological Analysis. London: Methuen, 1958.

Fleshman, Arthur Cary. The Educational Process. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1908.

Foshay, Arthur W. (ed.). The Rand McNally Handbook of Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Frasier, George Willard and Winfield Dockery Armentrout, An Introduction to Education. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1924.

Freeland, George E. The Improvement of Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Garlick, A. H. A New Manual of Method. London: Longmans Green, 1896.

Garrison, Noble Lee. The Improvement of Teaching. New York: Dyrden Press, 1955.

_____. The Technique and Administration of Teaching. New York: American Book, 1933.

Good, Thomas L. and Jere E. Brophy. Looking in Classrooms. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Grant, James R. Acquiring Skill in Teaching. New York: Silver Burdett, 1922.

Groszmann, Maximilian P. E. Career of the Child. Boston: Gorham Press, 1911.
_____. Some Fundamental Verities in Education. Boston: Gorham Press, 1911.
Hall, Samuel R. Lectures on School-keeping. Boston: Richardson, Lord and Holbrook, 1829.
Hall, G. Stanley. Educational Problems, Vol. 1 and Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton, 1911.
Hardie, Charles D. Truth and Fallacy in Educational Theory. Cambridge University Press, 1942.
Hart, John S. In the School-room. Philadelphia: Eldredge, 1868.
Haskew, Laurence D. This is Teaching. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1956.
Heinmiller, Louis E. A First Book in Education. New York: Century, 1925.
Herbert, John. A System of Analyzing Lessons. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967.
Hildreth, Gertrude. Child Growth Through Education. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.
Hinsdale, Burke Aaron. Art of Study. New York: American Book, 1900.
Hissong, Clyde and Mary Hissong. An Introduction to Principles of Teaching. Chicago: John C. Winston, 1933.
Hopkins, L. Thomas. Interaction: The Democratic Process. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1941.
Horne, Herman Harrell. Story-telling, Questioning and Studying: Three School Arts. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
Holley, Charles Elmer. The Practical Teacher. New York: The Century, 1927.
_____. The Teacher's Technique. New York: Century, 1922.
Hymen, Ronald T. (ed.). Teaching. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1968.
Johnson, Earl A. and R. Eldon Michael. Principles of Teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958.
Johonnot, James. Principles and Practice of Teaching. New York: D. Appleton, 1878.
Jones, Lerris Henry. Education as Growth. Boston: Ginn, 1911.
Joyce, Bruce R. and Marshal Weil. Models of Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
Karch, Robert Randolph and Edward C. Estabrooke. 250 Teaching Techniques. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing, 1943.
Keith, John Alexander Hull. Elementary Education. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1905.
Kelner, Bernard G. How to Teach in the Elementary School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.
Kilpatrick, William Heard. Foundations of Method. New
Lamb, Marion M. Your First Year of Teaching. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing, 1956.
Lancelot, W. H. Handbook of Teaching Skills. New York: John Wiley, 1929.
LaRue, Daniel Wolford. Child's Mind and the Common Branches. New York: Macmillan, 1924.
Lay, W. A. Experimental Pedagogy. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936.
McCloskey, Gordon, Zeno B. Katterle, and Delmar T. Oviatt. Introduction to Teaching in American Schools. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1954.
McDonald, Blance and Leslie Nelson. Methods that Teach. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown, 1965.
Mackie, Margaret. Educative Teaching, Sydney, Australia: Angus Robertson, 1968.
McMurry, Charles A. Handbook of Practice for Teachers. New York: Macmillan, 1914.
McMurry, Charles A. and Frank McMurry. The Method of the Recitation. New York: Macmillan, 1897.
Mead, Cyrus D. and Fred W. Orth. The Transitional Public School. New York: Macmillan, 1934.
Melvin, A. Gordon. General Methods of Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
_____. Progressive Teaching. New York: D. Appleton, 1929.
_____. Teaching. New York: John Day, 1944.
_____. The Technique of Progressive Teaching. New York: John Day, 1932.
Miel, Alice (ed.). Creativity in Teaching. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1961.
Miller, Harry Lloyd. Directing Study. New York: Charles Scribners, 1922.
Minor, Ruby. Principles of Teaching Practically Applied. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
Monroe, Walter S. and Ruth Streitz. Directed Learning in the Elementary School. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Doran, 1932.
Montessori, Maria. The Montessori Elementary Material. New York: F. A. Stokes, 1917.
Mort, Paul R. and William S. Vincent. Modern Educational Practices. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
Moseley, Nicholas. Teachers Manual. New York: Cornell Maritime Press, 1943.
Mossman, Lois Coffey. Principles of Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1929.
Noar, Gertrude. Teaching and Learning the Democratic Way. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
Nuttall, L. John. Teaching Purposes and Their Achievement. New York: Charles Scribners, 1936.
O'Shea, M. V. Everyday Problems in Teaching. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1912.
Page, David P. Theory and Practice of Teaching. New York: A. S. Barnes, 1858.
Palmer, Anthony Ray. Progressive Practices in Directing Learning. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
Parker, Francis Wayland. Talks on Teaching. New York: E. L. Kellogg, 1883.
Parker, Samuel Chester. General Methods of Teaching in Elementary Schools. Boston: Ginn, 1919.
Parkhurst, Helen. Education on the Dalton Plan. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922.
Patrick, James N. Elements of Pedagogics. St. Louis, Missouri: The Author, 1894.
Peters, Herman J., Collins W. Burnett, and Gail F. Farwell. Introduction to Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
Peterson, A. D. C. (ed.). Techniques of Teaching. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965.
Pinsent, A. Principles of Teaching-Method. London: George G. Harrap, 1941.
Ragan, William B. Teaching America's Children. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
Reagan, G. W. Fundamentals of Teaching. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1932.
Reeder, Edwin Hewett. Simplifying Teaching. Chicago: Laidlaw, 1929.
Reeder, Rudolph R. Training Youth for the New Social Order. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1933.
Rein, Wilhelm. Outlines of Pedagogics. Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1895.
Retan, George A. Management and Teaching Technique in the Elementary School. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1933.
Rice, J. M. Scientific Management in Education. New York: Hinds, Noble and Eldredge, 1912.
Rose, Homer C. The Instructor and His Job. Chicago: American Technical Society, 1961.
Ruediger, William Carl. Vitalized Teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923.
_____. Teaching Procedures. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1932.
Russell, Charles. Teaching for Tomorrow. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1937.
Ryburn, W. M. Principles of Teaching. Oxford University Press, 1944.
Sabin, Henry. Common Sense Didactics. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1903.
Salisbury, Albert. The Theory of Teaching and Elementary Psychology. Whitewater, Wisconsin: Century Book, 1905.
Salmon, David. Art of Teaching. London: Longmans, Green, 1898.
Sanderson, Clara Wilson and George A. Rice. The Great Adventure of Pedagogy. Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1942.
Saylor, J. Galen and William M. Alexander. Planning Curriculum for Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.
Schmidt, C. C. Teaching and Learning the Common Branches. New York: D. Appleton, 1929.
Schutte, T. H. (ed.). Orientation in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1932.
Search, Preston W. An Ideal School. New York: D. Appleton, 1901.
Seeley, Levi. Elementary Pedagogy. New York: Hinds, Noble and Eldredge, 1906.
Shipley, C. Morton, Marjorie Mitchell Cann, John F. T. Hildebrand, and George T. Mitchell. A Synthesis of Teaching Methods. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
Shumsky, Abraham. In Search of Teaching Style. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
Simon, Henry W. Preface to Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
Smith, B. Othanel, Milton O. Meux, and Jerrold Coombs. A Study of the Logic of Teaching. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Smith, Eugene Randolph. Some Challenges to Teachers. New York: Exposition Press, 1963.
Spears, Harold. Some Principles of Teaching. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.
Stark, William E. Every Teacher's Problems. New York: American Book, 1922.
Stormzand, Martin J. Progressive Methods of Teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
Strayer, George Drayton. A brief Course in the Teaching Process. New York: Macmillan, 1911.
_____ and N. L. Engelhardt. The Classroom Teacher. New York: American Book, 1920.
Strebel, Ralph F. and Grover C. Morehart. The Nature and Meaning of Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1929.
Suchman, J. R. Inquiry Training: Building Skills for Autonomous Discovery. Merrill Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1961, 7, 147-169.
Thayer, V. T. The Passing of the Recitation. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1928.
Thomas, Frank W. Principles and Techniques of Teaching. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1927.
Thomas, Lawrence G., Lucien B. Kinney, Arthur P. Coladarci, and Helen A. Fiestra. Perspective on Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
Turner, Edwin Arthur. The Essentials of Good Teaching. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1920.
Ward, Herbert and Frank Roscoe. The Approach to Teaching. London: G. Bell, 1928.
Washburne, Carleton and Myron M. Stearns. Better Schools. New York: John Day, 1928.
Weaver, Gilbert G. and Louis Cenci. Applied Teaching Techniques. New York: Pitman, 1960.
White, Emerson. The Art of Teaching. New York: American Book, 1901.
_____. Elements of Pedagogy. New York: American Book, 1886.
Wiles, Kimball. Teaching for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
Wilson, Harry B., George C. Kyte, and Herbert G. Lull. Modern Methods in Teaching. New York: Silver Burdett, 1924.
Wynne, John P. The Teacher and the Curriculum. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1937.
Yoakam, Gerald Alan and Robert Gilkey Simpson. Introduction to Teaching and Learning. New York: Macmillan, 1934.
Zimmern, Alice. Methods of Education in the United States. New York: Macmillan, 1894.

EDUCATIONAL CONTROL FOR CRAZY-MAKING: NOTES TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE

Arthur G. Wirth
Washington University

I am trying to get some perspective from the early twentieth century debate over vocationalism -- and use it to distinguish harmful from hopeful developments in the present situation. I shall oversimplify and refer to the early debate as one between John Dewey and social efficiency philosophers like David Snedden.[1] I want to entertain the notion that the underlying issue, still very much with us, involves a basic difference over the idea of science as a model for the reform of institutions.

I want to focus on two institutions at the center of that debate: adult work and the schools as work places.

Both Dewey and the social efficiency philosophers assumed a close link between the design of work in industry and the quality of life in schools. Thus it is worth noting that in the Preface to Democracy and Education Dewey said his task in the book was to clarify how philosophy of education was related to the nature of science, democratic values and industrial reorganization. (The latter part has been the most neglected.)

There was agreement, too, that the effectiveness of productivity in both schools and industry would, in large measure, be determined by the type of control. Thus Dewey in his chapter in Democracy and Education on "Education as Direction" said that with formal education some form of direction is inescapable and the choice tends to be between direction "as control from without in the form of regulations" versus "a guiding assistance through cooperation."[2]

Snedden chose the former and Dewey the latter. One way of getting at the philosophical differences is to deal with their radically different images of how science could be a guide to reform: science as a model of technical control through scientific management, or science as a model or metaphor for release of human creativity.

David Snedden viewed the corporate-urban-industrial phenomenon as the foremost means for human progress. Those who bemoaned the mechanization and depersonalization of work were "simple-lifers" or "romantic impracticalists." Modern men might be subjected to fragmented, routine job tasks; but production specialization enabled them to live longer, more comfortably, and with new leisure. And the application of mass production methods to control school life could help share in the advance. As he put it, "Quantity production methods applied in education speedily give us school grades, uniform textbooks, promotional examinations . . . strictly scheduled programs, mechanical discipline and hundreds of other mechanisms . . . which are necessary if our ideals of universal education are to be realized."[3]

Snedden likened the good society to a winning "team group." A team was made stronger by specialization of functions. Some like the officers on a submarine crew would be trained to lead and coordinate; others would be trained for special functions in the ranks.[4]

The model was a Social Darwinist job efficiency approach. Jobs to be planned for kids in schools were roughly to parallel the design of jobs for adults. The rationalization of labor, rugged competition, and quantitative measurement of outcomes could increase efficiency in both realms.

John Dewey also was concerned with vocationalism but with a different perspective. Thus in Individualism Old and New Dewey held that the basic problem for the industrialized United States was a qualitative one. "Can a material, industrial civilization be converted into a distinctive agency for liberating the minds and refining the emotions of all who take part in it."[5]

Dewey was blunt about what he held to be the "fundamental defect of our civilization." We live in a culture where our technique and technology are controlled too exclusively by the "corrosive" materialism of our times. This springs, he said, from the notion cultivated by the class in power, that capacities of individuals can be developed only in a struggle for material possessions and power."[6]

> . . . (Economic) associations are fixed in ways which exclude most of the workers in them from taking part in their management. The subordination of the enterprises to pecuniary profit reacts to make the workers 'hands' only, their hearts and brains are not engaged.[7]

Elsewhere, he said,

> Much has been said about scientific management of work. It is a

> narrow view which restricts the science which secures efficiency of operation to movements of the muscles.[8]

The result is that the intellectual and moral development of both workers and management is one-sided and warped.

The alternative, Dewey said, is to know how the power of science, industry and technology can be directed toward "making a different sort of world and society."[9] Such a science, he said, would be:

> . . . at the opposite pole to science concluded as merely a means to industrial ends. A humane society would use scientific method, and intelligence with its best equipment to bring about human consequences. Such a society would meet the demand for a science that is humanistic, and not just physical and technical.[10]

And, said Dewey, "If a system of cooperative control of industry were generally substituted for the present system of exclusion -- there would be enormous liberation of mind, and the mind thus set free would have constant direction and nourishment."[11]

If Dewey rejected the scientific management model, what was his own image of science as a model for reform? Since we need a shortcut I believe it is useful to see the similarity in Dewey's tendency to see linkages between science and art and the similar stance by Jacob Bronowski in Science and Human Values. From this perspective "science/art" is a metaphor for the creative capacity of all human beings "to explore experience,"[12] to construct new meanings about themselves and their world. Science is a refined example of the capacity of every human to discover connections or unity in what had long seemed unlike. Thus Rutherford and Bohr could find a model for the atom in the planetary system, or illiterate Sherpas under guidance, could discover that two faces of Mt. Everett from different valleys are, in fact, one mountain. A preschool child can discover how to sort our blocks of different shapes.

To be human means to have the right to get in touch with our powers to construct meanings about ourselves and our own world, so our lives and our work makes sense. From this concept of science the obligation is to design both adult work and schools so that they enable all to be in touch with the wholeness of their persons as constructors of meaning.

The fact is, of course, that the scientific management model predominates. It is increasingly getting us into trouble because it denies us our basic right as humans to explore experience and to communicate honestly. If fragments us, it reduces us to parts of technically designed mechanisms.

Ernest House in the October 1978 issue of the Comparative Education Review unravelled the story of how the humanistic intentions of Title I were subverted when federal education programs were brought under the control of William Gorham and other deputies from Robert McNamara's Dept. of Defense. Their assigned task was to design and control the program so that its "goals could be stated, measured and evaluated in cost benefit terms."[13] Programs to educate children were reduced to the technical rationale of economic production functions. The debilitating effects on teachers and students has been multiplying ever since. Thus, if many kids are having trouble with reading, we harness them and their teachers to mechanical models which will yield guaranteed measurable results. We've been at that for nearly 10 years and we ought to be dazzled by the reading brilliance of our kids. It can, however, turn out otherwise. I give you an observational note of one of our graduate students who is observing first graders approaching their exciting initial experiences of "learning to read."

> T. Why aren't you doing your work, Alphonso?
> A. I thought we were going to read today.
> T. That's what we did -- you just had reading group.
> A. But, I thought we would read today.
> T. We did, Alphonso. We looked for 's' sounds in your book, did two 's' pages in your workbook and here is the worksheet you should be doing right now to find some more 's' words.
> A. But, I thought we would read today -- you know, READ read!
>
> (Journal Entry, Fall, 1978)[14]

But in the recent rush to attach schools to the technocratic ideology there is an interesting irony -- an irony that provides cause for a ray of hope. In the late Sixties, at the very time that schools were being bludgeoned into refined versions of the old Taylorist control, that model was being declared dysfunctional in advanced sectors of industry. The counter to scientific management is emerging as socio-technical design theory associated with values of industrial democracy, and it moves toward principles of the Dewey-Bronowski version of science/art.

The critique and the philosophical alternative is being developed by theorist-practitioners like Pehr Gyllenhammar of Volvo; and Einar Thorsrud, P. B. Herbst, Fred Emery and Eric Trist loosely associated with the English

Tavistock Institute and the Work Research Institutes in Oslo, Norway.

The motivation of their pragmatic reconstructionist philosophy of work was the break-down in the Sixties of the Methods Time Management model they had imported from the U.S.A. A young more highly educated Scandinavian work force was responding to the engineering model by absenteeism, apathy, sloppy work, alcholism and malicious mischief. The list transfers easily, or course, to large numbers of our school youth; to which we could add the demoralizing effects of seeing that teachers will lie and cheat when under the gun of "competency" pressures.

I can refer here only to several illustrative concepts and examples.

A basic insight of socio-technical theory is indicated by the term itself. It holds that the fundamental flaw of the cost efficiency model is that it insists on seeking purely technical solutions to systems which, in fact, are socio-technical.[15] "Socio" refers to the human part. The technical efficiency models are out of touch with the inner, personal, subjective, creative, spiritual aspects of human reality. To be out of touch with reality is to be crazy-making. It is to Gyllenhammar's credit that he saw that the mechanistic U.S. management model was harming productivity because it was lending to irrational divisions in the name of rationality.

For example, Swedish planners began to see that major problems were coming from more highly educated young workers. They began to consider the idea of replacing them with less educated Turks and Finns. The logic of staying with what purported to be a rational organization of work was leading them to reject the finest educated youth their country had produced. When they spotted this the alternative was to try something saner. Gyllenhammar's thinking developed as follows:

> People entering the work force today have received more education than ever before in history. We have educated them to regard themselves as mature adults. . . then we offer them virtually no choice in our overorganized industrial units. For eight hours a day they are regarded as children, ciphers, or potential problems and controlled accordingly.[16]

To neglect the capacities of the young is to invite trouble. To accept them as assets to be nurtured forces one into paths beyond scientific management thinking. The opening sentence in Gyllenhammar's People at Work sets the tone of the alternative chosen. "People not machines are the real basis for the spectacular growth of industry during the twentieth century."[17]

Volvo decided that it had misled itself into believing that its development was simply due to resources identified as capital, technology, and equipment. Its future now was dependent on its educated people -- education was the invisible asset. To utilize the human resources required viewing every worker as entitled to a dignified work place with opportunity for personal development and a chance to influence work commensurate with his or her ability.[18]

The basic decision had to be to reject more time and motion studies and to focus energies on creating a work process which would increase worker autonomy, initiative and collegial collaboration.

I shall limit myself to one example. At the Kalmar plant a key change was to design technology to give people the flexibility to reorganize themselves at work. Instead of attaching workers to a moving line, materials were to be brought to work stations where autonomous groups of 15-20 persons could do their own organizing. The heart of the Kalmar technology became moveable carriers, subject to a variety of controls by workers. Work teams could design their own work and rest rhythms, job rotation, and collaborative plans for trouble shooting. Responsibility for quality control was handled by asking each unit to conduct its own inspections. The unit received computer feed-back on the performance of the final test-drive of the car. (The technical part of socio-technical assumes that people will be genuinely serious about technical knowledge and skills.)

The issue as Gyllenhammar began to see it was that, "Technology can strangle people. On the other hand, if it is designed for people, technology can also be a liberator. . . It is possible to devise new solutions to combine rational technological systems with greater freedom for human choice."[19]

Furthermore, as the rate of technological change increases it becomes necessary "to build learning capacities into the organization of industrial work teams."[20] Within this framework, work teams of persons engaged in ongoing learning become capable of doing research both to find ways to improve production and to develop strategies for coping with changes.

The Scandinavians are assuming that their decision to develop a society of highly educated persons will increasingly lead to rejection of traditionally engineered technology where "hired hands" are managed by authoritarian leadership. It will lead to a demand for access to "good work."

They are moving toward a position articulated by John Bremer that the test of a demo-

cratic society's excellence is the extent to which it supports the learning of all its members in all its institutions. And that is right out of the science/art orientation of John Dewey.

I don't need to draw elaborate implications about the meaning of the socio-technical model of "good work" for teachers and students. I believe that the influence of the scientific management model is so pervasive that we cannot get significant relief from its chilling effect on schools without a simultaneous challenge to its efficacy for work itself.

There is a chance that in the decades ahead a battle on this issue could emerge. Important factors that are motivating the Swedes are present here, too. But it is foolish to underestimate the resistance. It calls for nothing less than new economic assumptions. It requires as Willard Wirtz put it, ". . . a new economics that takes the human potential as its starting point. [It] would start from a commitment to make the fullest practicable use of . . . whatever talents are inside people instead of from a consideration of the most profitable use of the elements inside the fragile crust of the planet."[22] We would begin to measure policies in terms of how much strain they placed on natural resources and how much use or misuse they made of well-educated human resources.

It would require us to see, like the Scandinavians, that the technocratic control model is leading us to create too many institutions that are crazy-making. "Crazy" comes from an old Norwegian word krasa meaning crushed or fragmented, while "whole" come from the old English hal from which we get words like hale, whole, health, which have to do with "being together." Crazy-making institutions are those which fragment us, keep us out of touch with the wholeness of our persons, and out of touch with our entheos -- our God within, or our personal enthusiasms. They tie up our energies in ways which deny us authentic communication and community. That way is bad for kids. It is driving our most creative and caring teachers out of the profession.

If we have self-respect, we ought to stop it.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Arthur G. Wirth, Education in the Technological Society. (New York: Intext, 1972).

[2] John Dewey, Democracy and Education. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916), p. 28.

[3] David Snedden, Toward Better Education. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1931), pp. 330-31.

[4] David Snedden, "Education for a World of Team Players and Team Workers," School and Society. (Vol. 20, Nov. 1, 1924), p. 554.

[5] John Dewey, Individualism Old and New. (New York: Capricorn Books, 1962, ©1929), p. 124.

[6] John Dewey, Liberalism and Social Action. (New York: Capricorn Books, 1935), p. 89.

[7] John Dewey, Individualism Old and New. pp. 131-132.

[8] John Dewey, Democracy and Education. p. 98.

[9] John Dewey, Liberalism and Social Action. p. 88.

[10] John Dewey, Individualism Old and New. p. 138.

[11] Ibid., pp. 132-33.

[12] Jacob Bronowski, Science and Human Values. (New York: Harper and Row, 1965, ©1956), p. 72.

[13] Ernest R. House, "Evaluation as Scientific Management in U.S. School Reform," Comparative Education Review. (Vol. 22, October, 1978), pp. 388-90.

[14] Rita Levant, Washington University, Fall 1978.

[15] See P. G. Herbst, Socio-Technical Design. (London: Tavistock Publications, 1974).

[16] Pehr Gyllenhammar, People at Work. (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1977), p. 4.

[17] Ibid., p. 7.

[18] Ibid., pp. 21-23.

[19] Ibid., pp. 68, 159.

[20] P. G. Herbst, Socio-Technical Design, p. 207.

[21] John Bremer, A Matrix for Modern Education. (Toronto: McClellan and Stewart, Ltd., 1975), p. 27.

[22] Willard Wirtz, "Education for What?" in Dyckman W. Vermilye, ed., Relating Work and Education. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).

FBI SURVEILLANCE OF THREE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATORS: CURRICULAR ASPECTS

Murry R. Nelson
Pennsylvania State University

H. Wells Singleton
University of Toledo

Recent inquiries into covert activities of the several intelligence agencies of this nation have revealed the existence of detailed files on various individuals and groups in the United States. According to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities, Chaired by Senator Church, "The covert relationships with the C.I.A. [and F.B.I.], 'range from academics making introductions for intelligence purposes . . . to academic research and writing where C.I.A. [and F.B.I.] sponsorship is hidden.'"[1] The areas of surveillance and influence were as broad as the relationships themselves. Agriculture, education, physics, politics, mathematics, et.al., were just a few of the areas deemed worthy of close scrutiny.

Prior to the revelations of the various investigatory committees and the subsequent Freedom of Information Act as amended in February of 1975, the general public had virtually no access to information gathered and secured by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Over the years that agency has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining surveillance within the United States. Many critics of the bureau have charged that in fulfilling that task the FBI has prevented the free exchange of ideas to the degree that, "Speakers, teachers, writers, and publications themselves were targets of the FBI's Counterintelligence program."[2] Even though much of the FBI's alleged illegal activities were concentrated in the mid-1960's and the student protest movement, recent released documents indicate that the bureau frequently engaged in such surveillance activities during prior times of national unrest and uncertainty.[3]

These periods of uncertainty were not confined to one decade. During most of the Twentieth Century history of the United States there have been outspoken critics of the path that our Nation was taking. The most consistent criticism arose during the Great Depression and this period from 1930-1940 was one of trauma, introspection and a feeling of national guilt as Americans sought answers to questions concerning this most devastating occurrence in our history.

The depression brought to the fore a new age in American education as a small but significant group of educational leaders sought changes in the structure of the curriculum in an attempt to ward off any future catastrophies of a like nature. Three of those leaders provided significant impetus to the inquiry of educational purpose. John Dewey, George Counts and Harold Rugg had all feared America's "decline" as early as 1925 and during the depression they probed for answers related to the causes of that depression.

There can be little doubt that these advocates for reform in education were espousing a radical,[4] and to a great degree, psychologically threatening departure from the previously tried and true traditional approaches. Such advocacies brought attention from pressure and special interest groups who advocated particular points of view and who were not generally able to comprehend the concepts to which progressives addressed themselves. Consequently the period 1930-1940 was one of serious repression of academic freedom as evidenced by Beale's book Are American Teachers Free (1936) and the Seventh Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies entitled Education Against Propoganda (1937).

Rugg's books were strongly defended by many school people and university professors (even those who disliked Rugg) on the basis of academic freedom. Counts and Dewey strongly supported Rugg's position and they too, were accused of Communism, socialism and Anti-Americanism in the wake of "My Country, right or wrong" fever that swept the Nation. Amidst this background, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was quietly (and in some instances, blatantly) gathering information on these educators. The intent of the authors' research was to determine how the government, represented by the FBI, regarded Dewey, Counts and Rugg and what, if anything, they did to influence popular feeling towards these educators.

The authors conceived of this study in the spring of 1976 and began what proved to be a thirteen month pursuit of the FBI files on Dewey, Counts and Rugg. A summary of the steps followed is given here to both aid other scholars in their pursuits as well as to acquaint them with the incredible amount of lag time involved when dealing with governmental agencies under the Freedom of Information Act.

March 1976 - Study conceived, requests made.
May 1976 - FBI requests additional data, third party.

June 1976 - Some additional data supplied (Mrs. Counts approval)
July 1976 - Congressional letters written
October 1976 - Final permission granted by Sidney Hook for the John Dewey Society.
January 1977 - Notice from FBI on availability of data.
May 1977 - FBI denial of data.
July 1977 - Release of all FBI files.

Nearly 400 pages of information on the three educators had been gathered. This consists of reports by the Bureau, other agencies and private groups, letters, and articles. Interestingly there is very little chronological overlap among the three individual files. The material gathered on Dewey centered primarily on his work with The People's Lobby which Dewey served as president. This material is mostly from the 1930's. Material was not gathered on Counts until the late 1940's and then only because of his support of the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This latter support, and subsequent file were not started until 1963 when Counts was 74 years old. This type of paranoiac fear is more a reflection of the insecurity of FBI Director Hoover than of the involvement of George Counts in the NAACP.

Rugg's file with the Bureau was begun in 1942 and reflected the national interest in the controversy over the Rugg social studies materials. Material was continually gathered and reports filed on Rugg almost until his death in 1960 at the age of 74.

The curricular aspects of the files focus most specifically on Rugg, though the curricular ideas of Dewey and Counts might seem less credible as a result of FBI leadage on the gathering of files on these individuals.

Dewey's file initially contains a mass of information dealing with his involvement in the People's Lobby, a watchdog organization dedicated to the principles of good government and public disclosure (a Common Cause of the 1930's). Many individuals were interviewed "under pretext" about receiving mimeographed letters of the People's Lobby but all recalled that "the letter had been received at their respective offices and promptly destroyed."

Apparently the Bureau's discretion was not the most admirable since Dewey or someone associated with the People's Lobby, sent several copies of the People's Lobby Bulletin directly to J. Edgar Hoover along with an invitation, in 1934, to attend a People's Lobby Conference on "America's Public Ownership Program."

It does not seem unlikely that many others might have heard of the Dewey "secret" investigation. The leaks of the McCarthy era and of Watergate have served to reinforce this supposition. If it is so, and merely using FBI files as a resource precludes verifying that contention, then damage to Dewey's prestige may have been far reaching. This potential damage may have included a loss of respect for Dewey's educational thought and a subsequent drop in the sales of his many books on education (particularly curriculum).

A gratuitous letter from a magazine publisher listed organizations that Dewey belonged to, mostly liberal, humanitarian causes. The letter sparked an investigation into Dewey's affairs in 1943 which produced no information that suggested Dewey was a communist.

An investigation which the Director of the FBI ordered in 1957 summarized most of what the Bureau had done with John Dewey over a period of almost 30 years. Why, five years after Dewey's death, such a request for information was made by the director is not clear, although the request did state, "Let me have a summary on John Dewey, the educator who fathered the idea of "progressive education!" The Bureau listed many ideas and organizations to which Dewey subscribed over the years but no hint of Communism is ever supported and the Bureau clearly admits such.

Two personal letters sent to Hoover in 1953 and 1959, respectively, concerning Dewey and Communism were answered with a standard reply, i.e. the Bureau is not at liberty to comment positively or negatively on these personal inquiries. This did not prevent the Bureau (though not Mr. Hoover personally), from cooperating fully with a request from the Americanism Department of the general Federation of Women's Clubs who, in 1952, asked the Bureau to send to them, "whatever you have available to organizations on Dr. George S. Counts." Apparently the Bureau could stand on professional principles when it had no negative information but when it had questionable data, discussed below, the Bureau was quite cooperative.

In contrast to the material gathered on Dewey, information accumulated by the Bureau on Rugg and Counts reflects incipient McCarthyism rather than the fears of worldwide depression.

Harold Rugg's file begins in 1942 and contains initially the reprints of articles by some of Rugg's most determined enemies -- George Sokolsky of the National Association of Manufactures; Augustin Rudd, a business executive active in the American Legion and a reprint from an arch conservative magazine called The Beacon Light published by a group in California. The Bureau did not begin this file on its own but obtained the material "gratuitously" from a private citizen. One

can only speculate who that might have been since the FBI has eliminated most references to people in their various reports. The material gathered is full of the half truths that marked the attacks on Rugg's books. Some of the derogatory remarks reflect much more on the times than they do on Rugg, e.g., Rugg is accused of trying to make students "extreme internationalists, if not communist minded." In an era of new isolation, an internationalist was almost synonomous with communist.

Other Rugg sins are being a member of the "Citizens' Committee of One Hundred" formed by the American Civil Liberties Union for "the purpose of getting disloyal school teachers reinstated by the School Board of New York" (FBI files) and the elimination of history, geography and civics as separate studies and their replacement by social studies. Indeed this was one act that solidified Rugg's posture as anti-American, according to many critics.

Despite collecting this information the FBI went no further at that time and they seemed to have had no direct hand in any of the Rugg textbook removals around the country.

In July 1951 Rugg, who had recently retired from Teachers College, was invited to speak at the annual Boyd Bode Educational Conference at Ohio State University in Columbus. Rugg's speech was concerned with the same ideas Rugg had espoused over the years -- social reconstruction for a better world community. He spoke out strongly on the restraint of academic freedom but these topics alone were not sufficient enough to arouse real controversy. What did arouse many people apparently was that Harold Rugg was saying them again.

Many of the critics of Rugg in the 1940's had obviously hated Rugg -- not just politically but personally. Following the Rugg controversies of the early 1940's, Rugg's texts were removed from many school shelves and sales plummeted to such a degree that Ginn and Company, the publisher, halted publication. This victory over Rugg's textbooks was viewed by many of his critics as a triumph over Harold Rugg and "anti-Americanism" ideas. Thus, Rugg's failure to totally disappear from the social scene angered these so-called patriotic Americans once again. This time, however, the specter of McCarthyism was on their side and they were able to convince the FBI that Rugg was a threat to security. This again reflects more on the times than on Rugg since he was in 1951 a 65 year old emeritus professor saying essentially the same things that he had been saying publicly for over twenty years.

This might have been the end of the FBI files on Rugg but in 1953 the New York Security Affairs Chief, apparently acting on the 1951 Cincinnati memo made a request to Director Hoover to conduct a preliminary investigation of Rugg to determine whether he should be included in the security index. Two weeks later authorization was granted and the investigators were to "be guided by instructions set forth in Section 87C of the Manual of Instructions relating to investigations of teachers." From that point until Rugg's death in 1960, he was under sporadic investigation.

In a miscellaneous file of Rugg's New York report he is also cited for "his lack of morals'," as well as his supposed sympathy for communism. Some hysterical people had briefly emerged to spew total untruths. E.g. A woman wrote a letter to J. Edgar Hoover on September 7, 1951, "in which she advised that she had known 'red professionals at Columbia.' She further declared 'I heard Harold Rugg at a mass meeting of teachers in Horace Mann auditorium, some years ago tell the group that under the Communist regime, every teacher in the United States would get at least five thousand dollars.'"

The report then focused on selected speeches and writings of Rugg, particularly the Ohio State address. Other attacks had come from Hearst papers and the aforementioned New York State Economic Council, headed by Marvin K. Hart. Another of Rugg's great sins was the mentioning and the quoting of Karl Marx in his textbooks and writings.

In June of 1954 a recommendation was made that a Security Index Card be prepared on Rugg because he was a Communist.

In July, JAJ (or J. Edgar Hoover) rejected the recommendation because of insufficient information to warrant such a recommendation. The New York office was advised to "remain alert to report any additional information indicating subject's affiliation with the Communist Party of Communist front organizations. . . ."

Three other reports were filed on Rugg in 1959, the last coming six months before his death in 1960 but no further action seemed to come of these reports.

The case of George Counts is perhaps the saddest among the three. Counts was the most radical and most outspoken in his defense of so called Communist ideals. Counts, unlike Rugg, saw social reconstruction as a political act and Counts was very political indeed. He was a union organizer serving as the first president of the AFT, a staunch defender of civil rights, fluent in Russian and a visitor to the Soviet Union. One thing that makes Counts' case so sad is his almost total disavowal of all of these things during the fear-plagued 1950's. Rugg and Dewey stuck to their views, interpretations and principles despite obvious intimidations. Counts finally "caved-

in" and his case illustrates the type of destruction the FBI, in conjunction with other government personnel could cause to an individual.

During the 30's Counts was a close friend of the Soviet Union and of many Communists though he wrote in The Prospectus of American Democracy (1938) that the U.S. could successfully provide a better plan of government that is neither Communist or Fascist. Despite these acts, it appears that no file on Counts was started until 1942.

The conclusion of the report of April, 1943, was that Counts was "not sympathetic to the Communist cause. For this reason, no further investigation is being contemplated in this office, and this case is being considered closed."

In December of 1940, according to this FBI report, Counts "had conspicuously remained silent while twenty-one members of his own local (527 of the AFT), faced dismissal at Brooklyn College due to the activities of the (Rapp-Coudert) Committee." It was this type of action (or inaction) that caused Harold Rugg to lose much respect for Counts. As mentioned before Rugg was reasonably consistent in what he supported and generally that was justice. This may sound sophomoric but Rugg was neither politically motivated or concerned. Counts, on the other hand, was far more militant. Often his views were similar to Rugg's, but usually they moved more toward political action. Rugg was markedly disappointed (according to Rugg's widow) when Counts failed to support social justice. Instead Counts, in Rugg's view, placed anti-Communist feeling before such justice.

By 1942, Counts was very active in anti-Communist organizations but his guilt by association with "front organizations" in the 1930's made him still suspect, even after FBI reports that seemed to "exonerate" him. A 1947 report on the International Film Foundation mentions George Counts as "identified with Communist Front organizations."

By 1948, the Bureau, though still suspicious seemed ready to concede tht Counts was indeed not a Communist but as Treasurer of the Workers Defense League was involved with an organization HUAC (or HCUA) had cited as a Socialist organization.

In 1950, Counts was contacted by the New York office of the bureau in its investigation of another alleged Communist and Counts was the subject of as much scrutiny, it seems, as that accorded the individual being investigated.

In March of 1951, a particularly damaging report was added to Counts file. A former European Communist was interviewed in Paris in January of 1951. This person was describing a Communist party member known as a "member at large." In the course of this description he gave an example of such a member as "an important Columbia University professor, whose name was KOUNTZ or COUNTZ (phonetic)." This person stated that "It was important that such an individual be not identified as a Communist Party member. Therefore, . . . his actual membership might be hidden . . . (and he) should not be known as a Communist." This informant added that "he met KOUNTZ in 1934 . . . at which time he told (the informant) that he was a Communist Party member." The agent making the report concluded that the person mentioned was obviously George Sylvester Counts. . . .

This information caused a new investigation into the Communistic tendencies of George Counts, an investigation that stretched through December of 1951 and which proved totally inconclusive of anything relating to Counts.

In early 1952, 19 citations were placed against Counts by the House Un-American Activities Committee for Communist learnings, based on his writings in the 1930's. Not long after that, in talks at the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology, he repudiated his earlier advocacy for revolution and Soviet Communism. The FBI file includes the Pittsburgh Press account of Counts' talks. (These were gathered not by the Bureau but by the Rev. W. O. H. Garman, vice-president of The American Council of Christian Churches and sent to J. Edgar Hoover.) Counts explained that he wished to see Russia and the Allies joined in the 1930's "as the best deterrent to Hitler's ambitions."

Garman subsequently wrote letters of protest to the two universities and to John S. Wood, Chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In the latter note, he repeated Counts' transgressions as cited by the Committee and added some others such as favoring and approving "the use of the infamous Rugg textbooks all emanating from Columbia University, and which the Legion and other patriotic organizations were successful in having removed from 1300 school systems." Teachers College is also mentioned and charged with "having taught the teachers Socialism for thirty years."

Garman went on to "tattle" on Professor Thomas because he totally "refused to accept as evidence the findings of the Un-American Activities Committee, which committee he belittled and spoke of most disrespectfully." The conclusion of Garman's letter does note the attacks Counts made on Communism but Garman asserted that Counts was not trying "to teach Socialism to the youth of the land." The new focus of Garman's wrath was a series of UNESCO textbooks published by Teachers College. In letters to the Presidents of Pitt, Carnegie Tech., Director Hoover, Congressman J. T. Wood, J. S. Wood, and Senator Jenner, he

cites these texts as an attempt to use "the classrooms of the Nation to teach Socialism."

Investigation resurfaced in 1963 out of the Philadelphia office when Counts was then a resident of New Hope, Pa. With no additional information to be found on Counts, his file seems to have been closed, though not officially. This last report was October 15, 1963 and Counts died in November of 1974. For the last eleven years of his life it appears he finally had escaped the shroud of FBI surveillance.

Probably the most dismaying conclusions that this research has indicated is the oft-times capriciousness used by the bureau in starting files, in reacting to requests, in releasing seemingly confidential data and in maintaining surveillance in the face of almost universal denials of wrongdoing. This caprice has even extended to the release of documents under the Freedom of Information Act -- e.g., in Counts files there are far fewer deletions of Bureau "bigwig's" names than in Rugg's. In the Rugg files names are even deleted from newspaper clippings! Overall the pattern of deletions and release of data is one of no pattern. Indeed, the Bureau in our estimation appears as a reactor to minor transgressions rather than a well informed body prepared to initiate surveillance. It is not our desire to see the Bureau act this way. Rather that is the picture that the Bureau seems to paint of itself and, in our estimation, it is a shame, at least in part.

There are many gaps in the released files and we hope to fill those gaps with documents that have been withheld inexplicably. We also hope to check the sources cited in these files for accuracy in the hope of further monitoring this type of governmental surveillance.

Overall, we were astounded at the interest shown in these three educators at various points in time. Indeed, much of the data collection is more of a reflection of the times than of the Bureau itself. Nevertheless, it is our hope that by being alert to potential governmental interference in academic freedom, we can more fully exercise that freedom in all the schools of our country.

What future directions might such research take and towards what ends? For this group there are obvious biographical pursuits that might be followed. Rugg, Counts and Dewey were only three eminent educators in the forefront of educational change and analysis during the progressive years. Many others were certainly the subject of governmental scrutiny during those years and many of these individuals would have had impact on the curriculum. Potential sources of inquiry might include David Snedden, an early curriculum analyst, whose working class background might have been sufficient grounds for socialist leanings; Hollis Caswell, a still lively individual whose lucid commentary at the recent ASCD convention might signal more insight into an FBI inquiry; Jesse Newlon, another of the Teachers College group, though his untimely death might have precluded the later opening of a file on him by the FBI; Paul Hanna, the author (with James Mendenhall) of Building America, a social studies monthly that received critical acclaim in the 1930's but was later consumed by the curricular controversies that also destroyed the Rugg curriculum; William Heard Kilpatrick who lent his name to the reformist group at Teachers College; Hilda Taba; Franklin Bobbit; Carlton Washburne and others. The list is long and certainly should be pursued in some manner. Our research has indicated that the FBI did little to directly hinder the growth of specific curricula. However, they did engage in less than secret investigations of certain individuals in curriculum. By "playing favorites" with this information the FBI was able to erode the credibility of Counts and Rugg and ultimately to aid in a similar erosion of their curriculum ideas and products.

Similarly, the Bureau might have begun files on various curriculum groups that might have been viewed as "soft" on Communism because of their defense of academic freedom. These groups might include the National Council for the Social Studies which Rugg co-founded in 1920 and which constantly battled the question of censorship in the 1940's; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; the John Dewey Society, which had most of the individuals discussed above as members; and the National Society for the Study of Education. There is no assurance of any of this surveillance but considering the pettiness involved in the files of Dewey, the Bureau apparently felt no cause too unimportant to pursue.

In conclusion, we should like to consider the question of what should be the role of governmental surveillance agencies viz-a-viz the curriculum. Our position is that the FBI and other agencies have no business in this area. If we cannot recognize the undermining of our own profession, however subtly, by internal or external forces, then we are indeed lost and the FBI can certainly not save us.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Karen Winkler, "The CIA Has Long-Developed Clandestine Relationships with the American Academic Community," Chronicle of Higher Education, May 3, 1976, p. 1.

[2]Ibid., p. 9.

[3]For example, a biographer of G. Bernard Shaw received tremendous data on the bureau's surveillance of that playwright. Recent files made public by the ACLU indicate the bureau kept the ACLU tightly watched from its (ACLU) inception.

[4]radical in its classical sense -- i.e., departure

THE PROGRESSIVE MALAISE OF REVISIONIST HISTORIANS -- AS SEEN BY A PROGRESSIVE

R. Freeman Butts
Distinguished Professor of Education
San Jose State University

I am assuming that this session is concerned with viewing the work of revisionist historians insofar as their research and interpretation bear on the work of the curriculum field, and as seen by those who viewed themselves as "progressives" in the period roughly from the 1920s to the 1950s. Strictly speaking, I was not, and am not now, in the "curriculum field" dealing with elementary and secondary schools. My main work in curriculum development has had to do with the courses in the foundations of education at Teachers College from the mid-1930s to the mid-1950s. But I have studied some aspects of the historical development of the curriculum in schools, and I certainly thought of myself as a "progressive" and a "liberal" even before I went to Teachers College from Wisconsin in 1935. And I have studied something of the revisionist interpretations of progressivism and liberalism in the past decade or so.

Revisionism has accompanied a gratifying revival of interest in the history of education during that time. It has stirred up a great deal of controversy among historians of education since the late 1960s. For the first half of the past decade they were on the offensive, primarily against the traditional "progressive" history of education symbolized for them by Ellwood P. Cubberley and the revisionism of Lawrence Cremin and presumably myself, although I have seldom been mentioned by name. But during the second half of the past decade an increasing criticism of the revisionists' historiography and interpretations has, I would say, definitely put them on the defensive. Now I do not intend to review in general that literature. For those who are interested in it and not completely immersed in it, I refer you to the bibliographies and discussions in my new book, Public Education in the United States (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978).

The time is so short this afternoon that I can only give the outlines of my perspective that I think are pertinent to your interests in the history of the curriculum. I shall make it quite personal, a kind of oral history. I shall refer to a few examples to illustrate the similarities and differences of interpretation on particular problems as seen by some revisionists and by myself. If you are interested in my generalized view of the revisionists, I refer you to my paper entitled "Public Education and Political Community," (History of Education Quarterly, Summer 1974) which was the invited lecture for Division F of AERA in 1973; and to my paper "Once Again the Question for Liberal Public Education: Whose Twilight?" (Phi Delta Kappan, September 1976) which was the George S. Counts lecture at Southern Illinois University in 1976.

First, let me indicate a basic kind of agreement I have with some of the revisionists. It has to do with the relation of the present to the past in history writing. I think we agree that the historian's "present" inevitably influences his or her historical writing about the past. I believe this "presentist" view of history is still most succinctly put by Charles A. Beard:

> . . .every written history . . . is a selection and arrangement of factors, or recorded fragments of past actuality. And the selection and arrangement of facts . . . is an act of choice, conviction, and interpretation respecting values, is an act of thought.[1]

> . . .any selection and arrangement of facts pertaining to any large area of history . . . is controlled inexorably by the frame of reference in the mind of the selector and arranger. This frame of reference includes things deemed necessary, things deemed possible, and things deemed desirable. It may be large, informed by deep knowledge, and illuminated by wide experience; or it may be small, uninformed, and unilluminated.[2]

This is pretty close to the essence of "progressive history" as viewed by Beard, Frederick Jackson Turner, James Harvey Robinson, Vernon L. Parrington, and Carl Becker who also viewed conflict between the few and the many as more the stuff of American history than consensus, who believed that history writing should have relevance to the problems of the present, and who were committed to social reform, egalitarian rights and freedom, and a positive role for democratic government in achieveing a greater measure of economic and social welfare and security than could be achieved by laissez-faire capitalism. I was brought up on these liberal progressive views, and I continue in general to share them. I take it that revisionists do not share this

progressive liberal outlook, but that they do agree that the frame of reference of the historian is an important factor in history writing.

For example, Clarence Karier says in the preface to his book, Shaping the Educational State:

> All history is written from a perspective that is invariably shaped out of one's existential present. . . . the questions the historian asks of the past are important not only for shaping his particular view of the past, but also for determining his contribution to the solution to present-day problems. Historical interpretation, thus, is inescapably bound up with the problems of the present as well as the possibilities for their solution.[3]

And Paul Violas and Joel Spring agree with Karier in their joint introduction to the Roots of Crisis, a book which I selected as one of "The Outstanding Foundations Books of 1973" (see Educational Studies, Spring/Summer 1974, pp. 17-18):

> History is inevitably written from a particular perspective of the present. The historian can no more divest himself of the present than he can live in the past.[4]

So, apparently this group of revisionists, at least, agree to the good progressive view of the importance of the frame of reference in history writing.

The first thing that students of curriculum history should do is examine the frame of reference of the historian in order to judge for yourselves the validity and appropriateness of the interpretation as well as the "facts." The question could be put in this way: "From what 'present' is the historian viewing the past?" And here the divergence and disagreements begin.

Let me say a word about my own "present," or if you please, "where I am coming from." I believe my first real consciousness of Progressivism was in 1925 standing in long lines of people pouring into the rotunda of the State Capitol in Madison, Wisconsin to pay their respects to Senator Robert M. LaFollette. He was "Old Bob" and I was 15 years old, a sophomore in high school in Springfield, Illinois. I soon came to sense a great deal of difference between the enlightened progressivism of Wisconsin and the corruption and reactionary Republican politics of Big Bill Thompson as mayor of Chicago and Len Small as governor of Illinois.

I went to the University of Wisconsin in 1927 and joined the first class of the Experimental College under the leadership of Alexander Meiklejohn. I began to learn about freedom from him who later became one of the most eloquent and pervasive advocates of an absolutist view of freedom of expression in the First Amendment. But I also learned first hand about the "Wisconsin Idea" which rested upon a social service view of the university in promoting the welfare of the people of the state. I think especially of John M. Gaus, later of Chicago and Harvard, in public administration, and Paul Rauschenbusch in economics. I saw the efforts to combat corruption and remove the special interest influences of big business, the effort to design government so that it would be responsive to the many rather than to the few, and the need for an expanded and positive government to battle with corporate monopolies and promote the economic and social welfare of the vast majority of people.

John L. Thomas, Brown historian, summarizes the Progressive Era this way:

> The substance of the Wisconsin idea consisted of a set of related reforms: a direct primary law, an improved civil service, a railroad rate commission, an equitable tax program, state banking controls, conservation measures, a water power franchise act, and labor legislation. At the center of LaFollette's reform complex stood the independent regulatory commission, staffed by the new experts supplied by the state university and given wide administrative latitude.[5]

What I saw was the effort to use government on behalf of social reform in the interest of the greater welfare, equality, freedom, and justice for the majority of the people. And as the Great Depression hit while I was in Madison, I found the progressive impulse flowing into the New Deal and the Fair Deal. I was further convinced that a positive, activist democratic government was necessary in order to avert economic catastrophe. So the misery, frustration, and despair of the Depression is very much part of my "present," as is the struggle against totalitarian fascism and Nazism.

And I fought the Cold War in the ranks of the Academic Freedom Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union as we tried to counterattack against McCarthyism and extend the boundaries of academic freedom and due process in schools, colleges, and universities. I was also a member of the executive committee of the Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University which sponsored the studies by Robert M. MacIver and the history by Richard Hof-

stadter and Walter Metzger. And I think I helped Teachers College and Columbia to expand the boundaries of equality and freedom during the civil rights movement of the New Frontier and the Great Society, and finally during the campus movements during Vietnam and Watergate. It was this background which led me to look upon Vietnam and Watergate as perverted deviations and attacks upon the ideals of the liberal political community rather than as natural and inevitable outgrowths of the "progressive corporate liberal state" itself.

Now, I apologize for this lengthy personal report, but I believe that this was part of the purpose of this session. I will not presume to do the same for the revisionists. Their "presents" are of course much different, but I would venture to say that by and large several of them were born in the 1940s, went to school in the 1950s, were doing undergraduate and graduate work in the 1960s, and wrote their histories in the 1970s. Whatever else may be said, my "present" is larger than theirs. I believe that this is not merely a generation gap, although it is indeed that. Their "present" is very largely bounded by what Yale historian Sydney E. Ahlstrom has aptly called "The Traumatic Era" from the early 1960s to the mid 1970s "when the nation's sense of purpose fell to its lowest ebb."[6]

I need not catalog for you here the history of that decade and a half, but I feel confident it helps to explain the frame of reference of Karier, Violas, and Spring in Roots of Crisis:

> . . . this society is not structured to enhance the dignity of man but rather fosters a dehumanizing quest for status, power, and walth. . . . this society is in fact racist, fundamentally materialistic, and institutionally structured to protect vested interests. . . . The authors of these essays write from such a conception of the present, which shapes their own view of the past.[7]

Now I can agree with much of the substance of their view of this society, but where I have difficulty is their view that it was the liberal progressive tradition the produced such a society and in turn produced a system of public education which is designed to maintain and promote such a system. From my "present" it seems to me that the racism, materialism, and inhumane injustices come from conservative and reactionary sources rather than from liberal and progressive sources. This difference in historical perspective makes a world of difference to curriculum developers as well as to the profession and to the public as a whole.

I believe that what troubles me most about much of the revisionists' writing about progressivism is their failure to recognize distinctions that were exceedingly mportant to the participants of the past, and their tendency to generalize too easily. It almost takes the form of saying that any educators who lived in the Progressive Era were "progressives" or "liberals." These terms are very often used interchangeably and without precision. For example, Michael Katz in the final chapter of Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools says:

> The attitudes of the men who directed educational change, city superintendents and professors of education, underlines [sic] the essentially conservative nature of progressivism. . . . the little we do know suggests that they were strongly committed to bureaucratic forms and frequently racist in outlook.[8]

But then he refers only to David Snedden Ellwood Cubberley as his examples. But whoever thought of Snedden or of Cubberley as "progressives" or as "liberals?" Now to the unwary student of curriculum development this kind of juxtaposition of names and ideas comes to mean "Beware of anything progressive because it's really conservative and racist and bureaucratic."

Karier implies something of the same sort when he argues at length in several of his articles that the "corporate liberal state" bulwarked itself with a racist testing movement originated by Henry Goddard, Louis M. Terman, and E. L. Thorndike -- as though they were all good liberal progressives. They were certainly never considered to be in either category by those of us in the Social Foundations group at Teachers College. I heard William H. Kilpatrick (by any standard a progressive) say at a Conference at T.C. that the most pernicious and destructive influence upon American education had been that of E. L. Thorndike (whose office was just down the hall).

A pervasive theme in much of revisio history traces the origin of oppressive bureaucracy to progressivism and then the easy transition to "schoolmen" or "progressive administrators" who teamed up with businessmen to make the schools safe for corporate interests. Much of this interpretation regarding some administrators has merit to it, and much of the early documentation goes back to George S. Counts, an authentic liberal progressive, and to Ray Callahan's Cult of Efficiency who was Counts' student -- and mine. But what the revisionists do is neglect to recognize what historian Robert Wiebe so clearly points out: that there were two strains in the growing professional class of the Progressive Era: there were the service--oriented, welfare-oriented, democratic-

oriented, and social reform-oriented progressives (whom I would call liberals); and there were the business-oriented, social control--oriented, management-oriented, and efficiency-oriented "progressives" (whom I would call conservatives).[9] If you insist on calling George D. Strayer an "administrative progressive, " as even Dave Tyack does, I don't believe you can put him in the category of social reformer or liberal progressive. On the other hand, Jesse Newlon was a liberal progressive administrator. If you try to lump them both together somehow as "progressives," then it must be pointed out how they battled each other.

So much for general background. Now for your term-paper assignment. I urge you to read and compare the interpretation as given in my new book, Public Education in the United States with those presented in Roots of Crisis, Karier's Shaping the Educational State, and the new book by Paul Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class. All four are presented as general books addressed to the profession at large rather than exclusively to the history of education collegium. I suggest that you look at three or four topics of particular concern to curriculum development and try to determine which interpretation corresponds more closely to the complicated past and which gives you more insight into the present.

1. Vocational Education

Compare my treatment in Public Education (pp. 209-226) with Violas in his Chapter 6 on the rationale of vocational education. Violas argues that vocational education was designed by public schools primarily to keep working class children in their proper class by designing differentiated curriculums which in reality amounted to a working class education. It's quite true that some educators agreed with this view as I point out, but Violas does not mention the vigorous role played by John Dewey and other liberal progressives who worked hard to prevent just this eventuality and to achieve a genuinely democratic public education. I make a good deal of this with the help of Arthur Wirth's valuable study, Education in the Technological Society. Our different frames of reference were clearly at work here. What grades do you give us?

2. Academic Freedom

Compare my Chapter 10 with Karier's Chapters 1, 2, and 3 in Shaping the Educational State and Violas in Chapter 9 of Roots. Karier makes a great deal of Sidney Hook's position in the 1940s that membership in the Communist Party should be grounds for dismissal from the teaching profession. He includes one of Meiklejohn's pieces in opposition to Hook. He mentions in a footnote the decision of the Supreme Court in Keyishian v. Board of Regents (1967) which overturned its earlier Adler decision by ruling that membership in an alleged subversive organization and thus guilt by association could not constitutionally be grounds for a teacher's dismissal.

I deal with both Hook and Meiklejohn, and I regard the Keyishian decision as the culmination of a long struggle that has served to enhance the freedom of teachers over the past 50 years. Violas makes no mention of the Keyishian decision on the First Amendment, or the ACLU Academic Freedom Committee which had long fought for the Supreme Court's eventual position, but he does deal at length with the trials and tribulations, the pulling and hauling in the NEA and AFT.

I believe that it is very difficult for anyone who did not engage in the battles of the cold war to understand what Counts, Childs, Kilpatrick, V.T. Thayer, and a host of other liberal progressives went through in the 1940s and 1950s. Be very cautious about passing judgments on the liberal progressives of that period. They were not simply the bad guys and the Communists the good guys, or vice versa.

3. Americanization and Immigration

Compare my Chapters 5, 7 and 9 with Karier's Chapter 8 in Shaping the American Educational State and with Violas' Chapter 3 in The Training of the Urban Working Class. The underlying assumption they both make is that the public education was a prime agency designed to "restructure" lower class and immigrant children "so that they might better meet the labor requirements of corporate industry" (Violas, p. 66). Neither takes account of John Higham's very important point that our tradition of assimilation has had two recurring and contrasting aspects.

There was not only the narrow, often bigoted, sometimes xenophobic nativism that demanded instant Americanization by wiping immigrants clean of their traditional languages and customs in favor of a mainstream, middle class, Anglo-American, Protestant conformity. There was also a strong tradition of democratic, generous, cosmopolitanism that spoke for respect for the traditional cultures while still aiding the newcomes to cope with the mainstream of American life which they came to take part in.[10] I try to take account of both aspects in educational thought and practice.

4. Citizenship Education

Finally, I call your attention to a comparison of my views with those of three revisionists on the subject of what should we learn from the history of citizenship education in the United States. Research for Better Schools in Philadelphia sponsored a colloquium on this subject in April 1978. One paper was by Clarence Karier, one by Marvin Lazerson, and one by me. Commentators included Michael Katz, Christopher Lucas, and John Hardin Best -- all told, I suppose, a line-up of three revisionsits and three non-

revisionists. I believe the papers are being published by RBS.

It would be hard to find a clearer example of the role of differing frames of reference in relation to what we found in history and what the meaning of that history is for curriculum development today. Karier reads the history as the steady victory of the totalitarian state over individual freedom, and citizenship education in the public schools has always been on the side of the positive liberal state which easily moves toward the modern totalitarian state. His conclusion is that, in the interest of individual freedom, schools should not try to teach loyalty to the government and to the Constitution. He is pessimistic about any role for schooling in citizenship education beyond the straight-forward study of political institutions and political realities.

Lazerson found that citizenship education has never come to terms with pluralism and has not permitted root differences among cultural or ethnic groups to be thought of as legitimate differences. So he is pessimistic that citizenship education can ever be improved or reconceptualized. It was never made clear just what that meant, unless it meant that the liberal state must be socialized before citizenship education can be improved. Meanwhile, the schools should concentrate on teaching analytical skills on the model of the ethnographic approach of the anthropologists.

And Katz found the essence of our educational history to be in the conflict among social classes. In this conflict the schools have always sided with the upper classes, imposing their middle class values upon the reluctant lower classes. So the schools should not be involved in teaching values at all, since those would invariably be middle class values. The schools should stick to teaching the basic academic skills and not be involved at all in deliberate programs of civic or moral education, because they are bound to be used to maintain the present exploitative class-based status quo. He hopes the RBS programs in civil education will fail, for there should be no values taught in public schools. This conforms with his views in the final chapter of Class.

So, after all, the revisionists turned out to be very pessimistic about any kind of citizenship education and to be very conservative and traditional as far as their general approach to the curriculum and pedagogy is concerned. I should think that a decade of bold attack upon the public schools for professing to be progressive but really promoting conservatism; and then themselves ending up with a very conservative view of the curriculum would result in a certain malaise among revisionist historians.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines malaise as "a condition of bodily uneasiness or discomfort, especially a condition of bodily suffering or lassitude, without the development of specific disease." It goes on to give a quotation from the St. James Gazette for 1883 to illustrate the meaning figuratively: "There will be, first, a universal malaise; then the loss of the faculties of government and self-defense." Now I don't know what the context of that sentence was, but I can readily apply it to the American body politic. There is indeed a widespread malaise about public education and public institutions and especially government. A similar uneasiness among revisionist historians helps to weaken further the "faculties of government and self-defense" in the realm of public education. I should think that this would make them very uneasy."[11]

My own view of the history of citizenship education is that civil education has been the product of a three-way tension among the value claims of a democratic political community, the value claims of sequented pluralisms, and the pressures of the world-wide modernization process. The interplay and persistent conflict among these major elements in American history have resulted in the various pushes and pulls that have buffeted citizenship education throughout our national existence.

There have been persistent dilemmas: Americans have believed that universal education was fundamental to the welfare of the Republic, but they have drawn back from political indoctrination in the schools (especially if it doesn't agree with the views of particular groups). However, the urgency to promote civil education rises in times of national crisis or very rapid social change. Progressive reformers have had one kind of prescription; conservative traditionalists have had another. My own view is that the liberal reformist trends have been more in tune with the ideals of our democratic goals and practices. But modern society requires a much different kind of civic education from that of the past. It should deal directly and explicitly with the political values, political knowledge, and skills of political participation required of citizens in a modern democratic political community.

I have indicated in several articles that I think this requires radical changes in curriculum development, not the traditional approaches that revisionists apparently hold to. I am spelling out this view in a book I am writing for Phi Delta Kappa to be called The Revival of Civic Learning. A brief preview is to be published in the May issue of Social Education.

I still believe that my reading of history based upon a larger present and my interpretation of what we may learn from it for curriculum study will lead to a frame of reference that is larger, more informed, and more

illuminating than the more pessimistic mode of the revisionists based upon a foreshortened present. Once you have completed your research on these topics and turned in your papers, the verdict is in your hands and just possibly the future of public education and of the democratic political community as well.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Charles A. Beard, "Written History as an Act of Faith," American Historical Review, January 1934, p. 220.

[2]Ibid., p. 227.

[3]Clarence J. Karier (ed.), Shaping the American Educational State 1900 to the Present. (New York: Free Press, 1975), p. xvi.

[4]Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973), p. 1.

[5]Bernard Bailyn, David Brion Davis, David Herbert Donald, John L. Thomas, Robert H. Wiebe, and Gordon S. Wood, The Great Republic: A History of the American People. (Boston: Little Brown, 1977), p. 916.

[6]Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "National Trauma and Changing Religious Values," Daedalus, Winter 1978, p. 16.

[7]Karier, et al., Roots of Crisis, p. 5.

[8]Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. (New York: Praeger, 1971), p. 125.

[9]Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967, especially chapter 5. Curiously, Violas in The Training of the Urban Working Class refers to Wiebe's point that there were differences in outlook among business men, but makes no reference to Wiebe's distinction among business-oriented progressives and welfare-oriented progressives (see pp. 6-7). On the other hand, I make a good deal of the distinction; see Public Education in the United States, Chapter 7.

[10]John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. (New York: Atheneum, 1974); see especially Chapters 2 and 5. See also John Higham, "Another American Dilemma: Integration vs. Pluralism," The Center Magazine, July/August, 1974, pp. 67-73.

[11]I note that some of the radical revisionist economists are becoming worried that their views are being used by reactionary forces to weaken support for public education. See especially Herbert Gintis' reply at a symposium discussing the book by Sam Bowles and himself, Schooling in Capitalist America; see History of Education Quarterly, pp. 139-161. In a debate over vouchers in Palo Alto on October 19, 1978 Henry Levin (author with Martin Carnoy of The Limits of Educational Reform) opposed John Coons' proposed amendment in California to establish a state-wide system of vouchers on the grounds that it would destroy the public schools. When I asked if this represented a change in his views, he replied in effect, "When public education is threatened and the chips are down, I come down on the side of the public schools."

THE REVISIONIST HISTORIANS AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Hollis L. Caswell
President Emeritus
Teachers College
Columbia University

I shall make only one point. It arises primarily from my experience in working in state and city curriculum programs. It is my contention that revisionist historians have given far too little attention to educational practice in their interpretations of educational developments in the nineteen thirties and forties. They have made assumptions about practice that have little basis in fact, and they have ignored some highly significant aspects of educational development. Far too often they have simply assumed that theory reveals practice, that the ideas expounded by educational theorists accurately reflect practice in the field.

The consideration that revisionists give to educational practice is too limited in scope. For example, they have tended to view the organized progressive education movement as the major if not exclusive expression of liberal educational thought. Many seem to assume that to evaluate the liberal influence on curriculum development in the thirties and forties they need only consider the Eight Year Study and publications of the Progressive Education Association.

The fact is that the thirties witnessed a tremendous expansion of organized curriculum work, both through State Departments of Education and local school systems. During that decade alone I participated as general consultant in seven state-wide and five city curriculum programs, and in addition directed curriculum surveys in three other cities. Such work was underway in all parts of the nation. It was those programs that influenced educational practice most widely. They involved and influenced hundreds of schools and thousands of teachers.[1]

I believe that educators defined and tested liberal educational goals and methods far more extensively in that broad curriculum movement than they did through the activities of the Progressive Education Association. For example, I never was a member of the Progressive Education Association and yet I viewed myself as a liberal and was generally so considered. Thousands of teachers, supervisors, and administrators who studied with Kilpatrick, Bode, and their like-minded colleagues incorporated changes in their practices designed to accomplish more liberal goals. The Great Depression aided this process for it created an intellectual climate in which questions previously unwelcome about our social and economic system could be raised. A natural outgrowth of this ferment and questioning was the broad movement in State Departments of Education and local school systems to improve the curriculum. It is my conviction that until educational historians study this pervasive and influential movement they cannot judge fairly how American schools responded to liberal thought during this highly significant period.

Two important conclusions arrived at by revisionist historians seem to me to be lacking in evidence drawn from educational practice. One is the contention that educators have largely ignored the part played in education by other agencies in the community than the school. No doubt there is some truth in this contention. However, my experience in curriculum programs during the thirties and forties leads me to believe that in practice there was much more concern with the community as a whole than the revisionists have recognized.

For example, the appointment by the TVA in Norris, TN, of a Superintendent of Education rather than a Superintendent of Schools was not a happenstance action. It reflected a belief that education should be viewed as a community wide undertaking which involved several agencies. In turn, this action reflected a concern that many educators and community leaders throughout the nation had for broadening the concept of education to include the influence of other community agencies than the school. Study of the publications of the Society for Curriculum Study, the national association which reflected the broad curriculum movement to which I have referred, will reveal that substantial emphasis was given to this broad community view.

The second basic conclusion advanced by radical revisionists is unusually well presented by Diane Ravitch. She states: "... radical writers have charged that American educational institutions have not played the democratic, benevolent role that educators have traditionally claimed for them. On the contrary, assert these critics, the schools are themselves oppressive institutions which regiment, indoctrinate, and sort children, either brutally or subtly. . .processing them to take their place in an unjust social order."[2] This conclusion is based on an appraisal of practice in American schools. Consequently, the question must be raised as to

the soundness of their appraisal.

An adequate treatment of practice requires that it be considered from two points of view. First, there is the question of what aims, content, and methods are actually used in classrooms and what outcomes are realized. Second, there is the question of what direction is being taken by changes that are being sought and encouraged by leadership. Herein lies the best available forecast for the future.

The radical revisionists have acknowledged the difficulty of making a sound judgment about actual classroom practice with the data that are available. Nevertheless, they cite a few studies as being adequate support for their conclusion.[3] Pierce's study of the civic training of youth[4] and Gellerman's study of the influence of the American Legion[5] are illustrative.

I feel that the evidence from these studies is totally inadequate support for the sweeping conclusion they reach. These studies are largely concerned with what various organizations tried to get the schools to do. There is no convincing evidence of the extent of their influence on actual practice.

It has been my observation that practice in American schools is widely diverse. It differs markedly from classroom to classroom, school to school, and system to system. In surveys where direct observation could be made by trained personnel I found it most difficult to reach supportable generalizations about instruction in a single school system. Having had this experience I can but conclude when viewing the nation as a whole that the radical revisionists simply assert as fact what their theoretical position indicates should be the case.

The direction of change in the curriculum that field leaders sought in the thirties presents a very different situation. There is an abundance of source material to draw on. Curriculum bulletins of many types, illustrative teaching units, accounts of curriculum programs and the like were published by a large number of city and state school systems.[6] In so far as I have been able to discover the revisionists have completely ignored this material. Study of such material would reveal reasons to question the conclusion the radical revisionists have drawn. I shall give one illustration.

The State of Virginia had one of the most widely discussed curriculum programs in the thirties. The aims of education that should be accepted to guide the curriculum were widely discussed. Laymen as well as educators participated in formulation of the statement. One section dealt with broad understandings and supporting generalizations that should be developed by the students. I quote one:

THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE MASSES OF MEN STRUGGLE CONSTANTLY TO GAIN FREEDOM FROM THE DOMINATION BY THE FEW.

Supporting Generalizations

1. Individuals and powerful minorities have always sought control and subjugate the masses.
2. Many of the significant movements of history have been caused by man's effort to throw off the yoke of oppression and slavery.
3. Human rights do not come inevitably and as a gift.
4. Democracy is an experiment in the effort to establish human rights and freedom for all men men.
5. Almost everywhere gains in establishing human rights have been made only after much suffering or the sacrifices of war.
6. The present social order is not permanent. Man continues to modify it in his search for justice and freedom.[7]

I submit that this does not indicate an effort to develop and strengthen a curriculum designed to oppress the masses by making them docile servants of an all-powerful elite.

This then is my one suggestion to revisionist historians. If you would honestly better understand American education in the nineteen thirties and forties give more attention to what really happened in our schools and to the kind of change that leadership in the field was seeking.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Hollis L. Caswell and Associates, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.)

[2] Diane Ravitch, The Revisionists Revised. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), p. 3.

[3] Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas, Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis. (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), pp. 161-162.

[4] Bessie Louise Pierce, Citizens Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth, Part III, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, American Historical Association. (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1933).

[5] William Gellerman, The American Legion as Educator. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938).

[6] For example, see Henry Harap, A Survey of Courses of Study Published in the Last Two Years. (Western Reserve University, Curriculum Laboratory, No. 44, Cleveland, OH, May 20, 1935).

[7] Tentative Course of Study for Virginia Elementary Schools. (State Board of Education, Richmond, VA, 1935).

THE REVISIONIST HISTORIANS AND EDUCATIONAL THEORY

J. Paul Leonard
President Emeritus
San Francisco State University

Recently, I sat in a group of educated laymen who were discussing the "tragedy of modern youth," as they put it. The public schools during the thirty years following the end of the First World War were too permissive and still are today. They failed to teach responsibility, good manners, an awareness of the opportunities open to them, and the youth lacked discipline, values, or standards of behavior. The culprit, as they saw it, was the progressive educator who followed the doctrines of John Dewey. This man, who was the greatest educational philosopher of the century, led them astray. I thought of Hitler, as I heard him over the radio in 1939 berating his new found scapegoat -- the non-Aryan.

I was told that I should read some of the revisionist literature if I wanted to see how bad things were during this period. So I examined a few books, most of them saying essentially the same thing. The schools had failed to change the social conditions of our time; the power structure and elitist pressures on the schools were so great that no progress could be expected. We bored the youth with the past, with the ideals of a democratic society, and with elitist literature. To prove their point they gathered all the literature they could find to show that we failed. We produced massive dropouts, especially among the blacks and the poor. This is the Marxist approach to social change -- discredit the major social institutions, ally them with decadent institutions, and maybe hint a little intrigue with the power structure.

Nowhere did I find any recognition of the millions of children who were well served by the schools. One source I read went so far as to suggest that we should pay our youth the money it costs to educate them and turn them out on the streets to be educated by experience. Now tell me, in all honesty, what kind of education do you think they would get? I'm sure that only a few of the revisionists would condone such nonsense, but it does indicate how far the human mind can stray when it is confronted with disappointments and frustrations. It reminds me of the time I stood on the campus of UCLA and heard one of the young revolutionists of the sixties tell the students that these buildings should all be burned down. All the professors there, he said, were teaching only -----, the word he used isn't printable. When library research is selected to prove a preconceived and one-sided notion, it loses its intellectual character. I did not find anywhere any creative thought about how to rescue ourselves from the conditions exposed, nor did I find any balance of failure and success. But worst of all, you impinged our integrity. I assure you that we who worked in the curriculum field after the First World War did not sell our souls to the company store.

I would be the last to suggest that the schools were above criticism. We did have dropouts, especially among the poor and the blacks, but the schools alone were not solely to blame for this. The kind of criticism we have received tends to cause the general public to lose confidence in the schools, and we have seen to much of that during the last twenty years. One of the great problems of our time is our loss of faith in government, in business, in education, in our courts and in our professional people, and in one another. And no decent society can be built unless we have confidence and faith in each other and in our institutions. We, like all other people, have great problems to face before we can realize the society most of us want to see. As long as we believe it should be brought about within a framework of democratic structure, through representative government, and through an economic system which provides opportunities, from welfare to self fulfillment, we believe that our task is to make this system work better. We will of necessity make mistakes and, because we are human beings with freedom of choice, we will have to work within the framework of these social systems. Oscar Handlin, in his second lecture to the John Dewey Society said it well. "It was his major contribution that he progressively clarified the nature of the problems to be confronted. He engaged in exploring them in a refreshing, thought-provoking way, and reminded us constantly that the task of seeking our salutary relationships between patterns of education and the values of free men in a radically changing world is a continuing obligation."[1]

If we believe that we would be better off by changing completely our social structure, then my remarks are beside the point, and we will have to make revolutionary changes as some of our world powers have done and some of the lesser powers are doing today. But note that these changes have mostly been made by the barrel of a gun, and I see none of them that can match the quality of our society with even its present faults. I give this as an intelligent observation, not as sheer patriotism. To make the changes in society that we want made, we will need to do so, not by military force, but by the struggle to utilize the organized groups we have in our society to

join together to bring about reform. By this process we have made terrific changes the last fifty years in the United States. To name only a few: the Civil Rights Act under the Johnson administration was one of the most significant social acts since Emancipation; the organization and pressures of organized labor have enriched the workers to an extent unknown anywhere else in the world; the movement to break down discriminating employment practices has opened up employment opportunities for minority groups never before known; the rights of women have been increasingly recognized, from the granting of the ballot to the present when fifty per cent of the women are working, which may or may not be a blessing; the provision of the initiative process, prevalent in a large number of states, has become a weapon in our pluralistic society against the failure of our legislative bodies to perform their duties. Now don't ask me to prove statistically that the schools had anything to do with this. I can't. But neither can you prove that without the free public schools over the last fifty years these changes would have come about. The schools by themselves cannot eliminate discrimination or achieve integration of all groups, nor can they provide equal social or political equality. They can help, but the public and our institutions will really bring about social changes.

Those of us who worked in the curriculum field during the period under criticism adopted the idea that the traditional school of the nineteenth century was too repressive of children and too limited in its offerings and in its outlook to serve the needs of the children of our time, and so we worked under a philosophy in which we believed. Let me state a few of its major tenets.

1. Education in a free society should be universal for a period of years. This meant opening the schools to all children, generally from six to sixteen years of age, and this of itself loads the schools with an extreme range of interests, desires, abilities, and social and ethnic backgrounds. Thus the curriculum must face this problem.

2. Since our American society was paying the bill for these schools with taxes collected from individuals and business, we felt that in true democratic form both groups should have some chance to express themselves about what they were buying. In order to understand the economic system we studied the character of business and industry and its opportunities. We asked for the assistance of parents to help the teachers do their job.

3. We accepted the idea of equal opportunity to learn and thus prepared programs for the handicapped, those oriented toward industrial trades and in business, those who had dreams of leadership, and those who had visions of performance in aesthetics.

4. We decided that the teacher and the materials she handled were the key to achieving our goals, and therefore we brought the teacher into the act of planning what these materials should be, and we sought to integrate substantive material and methods.

5. We believed in the democratic character of our society and were firm in the belief that since this was the only society the child knew, his younger years of experience should acquaint him with the nature of this society as an aid to his own personal opportunities and his psychological development. We did not separate the individual from his society because this is the way we live, but at the same time we tried in so far as possible to study each child with all the tools available to understand how to develop individual or unique talents. Later on we introduced him to the problems or our culture and nation, and helped him to understand the nature of change so that he would be better able to participate in bringing about improvement in an orderly way consistent with the changing conditions of his time. Get involved, we said, but don't destroy without providing a satisfying and need-fulfilling substitute.

6. Dewey said there were three phases in the growth of a human being. The first was physical, play, during which the child learned to use his body, to relate himself to others, and to communicate. The second was when he learned to use tools — physical, social, and institutional ones. And the third was when he learned to apply the scientific method to knowledge of established conditions, to examine them, evaluate them and make decisions. Dewey added to this by saying the youth should learn "To select the new scientific, technological and cultural forces that are producing change in the old order; estimate the direction in which they are moving and ;their outcome if they are given freer play and see what can be done to make the schools their ally."

Our adversaries tell us that we have no interest in the poor, the foreigner, the oppressed, the black. They draw this conclusion from dropout figures. I did not live in India and the Middle East ten years to be unsympathetic with their condition, but I must confess that I have somewhat less concern for the wayward in our country than I do for the helpless in some other countries of the world. Many of our youth, acting in cooperation with adult groups in our country, can effect social changes. Someone has said that an aristocrat is a man who can control more than one vote. We wanted to encourage leadership in all groups to bring sufficient strength to bear upon a condition to unite the rest of us in supporting changed conditions. We wanted to reach as many individuals as we could and we wanted to create a better environment in which they might live more fully. We also wanted to extend the growth of youth into the higher reaches of the products of our social and aes-

thetic masterpieces, for it is the spirit of man that precedes intelligent action. You remember Shakespeare said in King Lear, "Learning is but an adjunct to ourselves."

We are proud of what we have done and regretful of our failure. We are not cowed by criticism when it is just, but we have little respect for Monday morning quarterbacks. We ask you with your perceptive minds to turn your attention to more profitable endeavors. To create or join a group of creative minds, who seeing the ever present problems before us, seek to make a better world, a better curriculum, a better school system, and a better man. This effort will bring about more productive change than whipping us who worked in the field 30 years ago.

After reading of our failures I feel like Keats said in his Ode to a Nightengale -- "My heart aches and a drowsy numbness pains my senses." I must go back to my mystery story and my Shakespeare, for one intrigues me and the other stimulates me."

FOOTNOTES

[1]Oscar Handlin, "Dewey's Challenge to Education," (Second Lecture to the John Dewey Society, 1959), p. 8.

[2]John Dewey, Creative Intelligence. (New York: Henry Holt, 1917), p. 694.

PROGRESSIVES AND REVISIONIST HISTORY

Paul C. Violas
University of Illinois

Professor Butts, Caswell, and Leonard were significant leaders in their fields during the middle part of this century and their work was part of the moving force of their era. I am in a somewhat uncomfortable position of responding to their papers as a "gad-fly," raising questions regarding their analysis of the educational histories written by those called "revisionists". Their papers reflect the general kind of criticism which has been directed at so-called "revisionist" history during the past half-dozen years.

Generally this criticism holds that "revisionists" are those historians who conclude that "American educational institutions have not played the democratic, benevolent role that educators have traditionally claimed for them. On the contrary, . . . the schools are themselves oppressive institutions which regiment, indoctrinate, and sort children, either brutally or subtly . . . processing them to take their place in an unjust social order."[1] The critics of revisionists' histories reject this conclusion by focusing on what they take to be the mistakes of individual historian's methodology, documentation, and analysis of sources. It is also often charged that revisionists fail to properly estimate the pragmatic political effect of their histories. Unfortunately, the critics usually fail to note the wide variety of methodologies, paradigms of analysis, and political persuasion exhibited by those historians who are considered revisionists. It is also assumed by many critics that if they expose an error in any one of these histories then they have discredited the revisionists' histories in general. Such a conclusion is, of course, unwarranted. It would be rather startling to find any single historian whose work is entirely free of error, and there clearly are errors in the revisionists' histories. The most lively debate about these histories, however, has been between revisionist historians. Few, if any, of these historians have made any claim to infallibility or even to having more than a small portion of the "whole" of educational past described in their work. Because of the wide diversity among those historians who might agree with the general conclusion quoted above and because they come to that conclusion utilizing different methodologies and often profoundly disagreeing over significant historical developments, I find the inclusive term "revisionists" both dysfunctional to a dialogue and personally distasteful. Nevertheless, I will use the term in this response simply because it is required. It is probably a mistake to attempt an analysis of revisionist history in any global sense. Rather it would be more profitable to analyze individual critical histories.

Similarly, it is probably more instructive to analyze the individual "case" made against the revisionists by each of these papers. We shall start with Professor Caswell's paper. He begins with the charge "Far too often they have simply assumed that theory reveals practice, that the ideas expounded by educational theorists accurately reflect practice, that the ideas expounded by educational theorists accurately reflect practice in the field."[2] This is by now a familiar criticism. It stems, in part, from the reaction to much of the early work of the revisionists which was directed toward understanding the intellectual underpinings of American schools.[3] The early work of the revisionists reflected a well ingrained belief in Western social science based on the Weberian and Parsonian thesis that ideas are the bedrock of social order. When this early analysis suggested that some of the leading theoreticians in the American past were perhaps less than fully democratic and that some of their ideas were congruent with racism, then almost immediately critics of the revisionists were ready to temporarily or selectively abandon the longstanding belief in the efficacy of ideas. Professor Caswell displays this selectivity. In the very next paragraph, after he challenges the nexus between ideas and praxis, he cites his own experience in the 1930s as a college educator and curriculum consultant as evidence that illiberal practices were not ascendant in the schools of that time, and he follows this with the statement, "Thousands of teachers, supervisors, and administrators who studied with Kilpatrick, Bode and their like-minded colleagues incorporated changes in their practices designed to accomplish more liberal goals."[4] Most observers would agree that ideas and theories are rarely incorporated unaltered into practice and would probably find even less controversial that most practice is based upon some theoretical construct, although that construct may not be fully articulated by the practictioners. The point should be clear, however; critics like Professor Caswell simply cannot have it both ways. Ideas and theories cannot be discounted a priori when part of a revisionists historian's analysis and then presumptively accepted as relevant when utilized for analysis by non-revisionists historians. It is obvious that ideas and theories can't be judged as efficacious only when it suits the critics' argument. What must be done is to examine the

nature of the historical analysis and the kind of claims being made from that analysis before one can judge if the historian has provided adequate evidence for the importance assigned to ideas.

Professor Caswell attempts this type of criticism in the third and fourth page of his paper when he refers to a specific documentation which he feels is inadequate for its purported task. Here he argues that reference to the work of Pierce and Gellerman in Roots of Crisis is inadequate to support the general conclusion regarding the undemocratic nature of schools attributed to revisionist's history. Indeed, Caswell would have been correct if that conclusion had been the object of the citation. It was not. Even a cursory reading of the chapter shows that it dealt almost exclusively with the 1930s debate about the issue of indoctrination. The page cited by Caswell explicitly stated that the studies cited were offered only as evidence of the successful influence of conservative pressure groups on school curriculum which, if actual, would make liberal or radical indoctrination in the schools more unlikely than conservative indoctrination.[5] Interestingly, in 1935 Professor Caswell had cited Bessie Pierce's work for evidence of the influence of conservative pressure groups on school curriculum. Of the materials prepared by such groups he said, "many times they are prepared with the deliberate purpose of propagandizing the nation through the schools for certain special interests."[6] If the Pierce work was sufficient evidence to warrant Professor Caswell's 1935 conclusions, one wonders why he now wishes to disregard its importance. This illustration points out the importance of carefully considering the claim being made by the historian and the dangers of shifting criteria for acceptable evidence.

Professor Leonard's paper also presents several of the standard criticisms of revisionists' histories. He begins with the assertion that the attempt to "discredit the major social institutions, ally them with decadent institutions and maybe hint a little intrigue with power structure" is the "radical" approach to social change. Professor Leonard then goes on to say that curriculum leaders "did not sell their souls to the company store."[7] Imbedded within these assertions are two separate, although related, charges: first, that revisionism is ideologically radical and therefore should be dismissed; and second, that revisionists' histories are founded on a conspiratorial conception of history. The former charge requires little more than to point out that it is based on a "genetic fallacy". Moreover, it is not true that all revisionists are "radicals". The conspiracy allegation is equally misleading, for it seeks to discredit an intellectual position without analysis of its argument, logic or evidence. I know of no educational historian, revisionists or any other variety, who has charged American educators with "selling out" to the company store or to corporate interests. What is often suggested, rather, is that educators and liberal reformers held a vision of the "good society" and of human nature which was very similar to that held by the corporate leaders of their time. As explicitly stated by one of the so-called revisionist historians, "This congruence of ideals does not imply that the settlements conspired to further the interests of corporate industry. It simply means that corporate leaders and settlement house residents agreed on the basic social structure necessary to fulfill the promise of American life. They also agreed that a new type man was required for this new society."[8] We might also remember William A. Williams' admonition, "consciousness of purpose is not the same as conspiracy." What has been documented is that many schoolmen and liberal reformers were conscious of their purposes and that often those purposes were congruent with the interests of corporate leaders.

The second major assertion of Professor Leonard's paper is "the kind of criticism we have received tends to cause the general public to lose confidence in public schools" at a time when such confidence is a national necessity.[9] This is a criticism previously leveled on several occasions by Professor Butts.[10] The raising of this charge, interestingly, tends to give credence to the conclusions of some revisionists regarding the elitism and the epistemological problems which inhere in the pragmatism of modern liberalism. This criticism clearly indicated that more important than the "search for truth" is the estimated pragmatic consequences of making public a critical analysis. Moreover, clearly implied in the criticism is the belief that in the presence of such histories the public would not be able to make intelligent (or perhaps "correct") decisions about education. What Professors Leonard and Butts seem to fear is that after hearing the revisionists' criticism of public schooling, the public may lose confidence in schooling as it now exists and agitate for significant kinds of change. It is important to consider why Leonard and Butts think such a turn of events would be a disaster. Is it because they are certain that the revisionists' critique is wholely wrong and that the public is not capable of understanding the errors? Or is it because they are not unwilling to submit current public schooling to an evaluation by the public, which is thought to be unable to make such difficult assessments? There are probably other reasons which Leonard and Butts might suggest to defend their concern that criticism of schooling will erode essential public support (or apathy). It is, however, difficult to ascertain how any rationale for this position can escape ultimately arguing that such criticism is destructive because when the public is agitated to make educational decisions, than the more "correct" judgments of experts will be over-

turned.

Thirdly, Professor Leonard charges, "Our adversaries [the revisionists] tell us that we have no interest in the poor, the foreign, the oppressed, the black. They draw these conclusions from dropout figures."[11] Indeed, this is just the contrary of what most revisionists historians have argued. Most have contended that educators were indeed profoundly concerned with just these groups and thus devised a myriad of programs specifically for them. I know of only one educational historian[12] who holds the view Leonard wishes to associate with the revisionists and the following is the response of one revisionists to the mistaken analysis: "It has been implied that public school officials, who were not particularly concerned with immigrant and working-class children, used the new industrial training programs as a way of getting them out of school as quickly and with as little expense as possible. The evidence does not support such an interpretation."[13]

An interesting and important point which Professor Leonard alludes to at various times and in somewhat disconnected way thoughout his paper is that the revisionists have failed to balance their accounts of the failures of public schooling with adequate accounts of the successes.[14] Further he argues that the quality of American society far outdistances its world competitors and ascribes much of American success to the peaceful evolutionary change in which the public schools have played a major role.[15] He is correct when pointing to the emphasis which revisionists place on the problematic aspects of American schooling and society. It is inadequate, however, to simply compare American successes with the record of other nations, for example Great Britain, the Soviet Union, Cuba or Japan. Any such comparison must include an analysis of the stated objectives and ideals of the respective nations as well as their relative material, geographic and demographic conditions. Most observers would surely agree that it is an understatement to say that America has long enjoyed advantages in its material base far superior to any other nation. Few would dispute that the stated objectives and the ideals of America have for at least two hundred years represented the single best hope for the conceptualization of a just society. We should be exceedingly unsatisfied with any evaluation of our successes which simply compares our performance with that of other nations rather than with our ideals and potential. We must compare American reality with the 'promise' of the American dream. Moreover, it seems a rather odd reading of our recent history to ascribe whatever success gained in the areas of Civil Rights legislation or equal employment for minorities and women to peaceful evolution and the effect of American schooling. Clearly in both of Professor Leonard's examples the effect of mass demonstrations, urban riots and often armed conflict has been the effective motor for change. It is also questionable how much real change has taken place even in these areas. Results of a three-year study of institutional sexism and racism by the Council on Interracial Books for Children sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation shows that women have made few real gains in the job market since the turn of the century and that while black families experienced some gains during the early 1970s the trend since 1975 has been regressive.[16]

Lastly, Professor Leonard states "We are not cowed by criticism when it is just, but we have little respect for Monday morning quarterbacking."[17] It is difficult to ascertain what he would count as "just" criticism but his plea sounds disconcertingly similar to the familiar liberal retreat from criticism during the sixties when critics were told that criticism must be "constructive" rather than "destructive" in nature. Constructive, of course, was a code word meaning criticism of the details of a policy were legitimate, but questions regarding the fundamental precepts and objectives of the policy were destructive. In any case, if we are to have "little respect for Monday morning quarterbacking" then we can have little respect for history. Indeed, the historian's task is very much that of a Monday morning quarterback. Those who object to such an enterprise will surely be doomed to repeat the failures of last Saturday's game plan.

In contrast to the Caswell and Leonard papers, Professor Butts' paper, in addition to its greater length, seems argued along a different tact. Nevertheless, he is essentially an apologist for the existing state of affairs in the public schools and the progressive liberal tradition which undergirds public schooling. Butts would have us believe that the main difference between his history and the histories of the revisionists is his longer and more mature "present" which began in the 1930s. The revisionists' "present," according to Butts, originated in the "traumatic era" of the sixties and, thus, limits their vision regarding the complexity of American history, the liberal tradition and the evolution of public schooling.[18] From his more "mature" position he sees that the "racism, materialism and inhuman injustices come from conservative and reactionary sources rather than from liberal and progressive sources."[19] He then invites us to compare his analysis of five specific educational developments with differing accounts by a variety of revisionists historians. For the sake of time let us concentrate on the first development Butts analyzes, that of the rise of vocational education.

Professor Butts asks his listeners to compare his treatment of vocational education in Public Education in the United States with that of Paul Violas in The Training of the Urban Working Class. He seems assured that

his analysis not only is more correct but that it will dispel the implications drawn from Violas' work that vocational education was a curricular innovation intentionally designed to produce a working class to fit the specifications of the emerging corporate industrial workplace; that the mechanism was a differentiated curriculum with different training provided for different children based on their socio-economic and ethnic origins as well as their projected life destinies. Butts is absolutely correct when he suggests that the only way to make an evaluation of the conflicting interpretations is to read both. Since he has also argued that the main problem with the Violas account is the failure to adequately deal with Dewey's opposition to certain aspects of vocational education, I think it is not unfair for me to suggest some potential difficulties in his analysis.

The Violas analysis places much emphasis on the decisions of individual historical actors within a context of conflicting class interests and ideological commitments. Butts rejects this in favor of an analytic framework which deemphasizes class conflict and highlights impersonal historical forces. He builds an explanatory paradigm with the "forces" of modernization playing a major causal role mediated by alternating and conflicting drives for pluralism and unification. Historical actors are grouped within this flux of historical forces as either conservative-reactionary (i.e., those representing industrial--business interests), progressive liberal (i.e., those favoring humanitarian and democratic goals) and efficiency minded liberals (i.e., those favoring social control techniques). This analytic framework plays a significant role in Butts' apology. By deliberately substituting "forces of modernization" for the corporate industrialism he begins with a positively connoted term rather than a neutral or negative one. But his linguistic slight of hand only begins here, for his model seems to suggest that much of recent American history was not caused by historical actors but by impersonal forces, e.g. modernization, and thus was inevitable. One example: when discussing the works of the Industrial Education Association and the Public Education Association in New York he hints that they were originally interested in "social welfare reforms". However, "they were soon forced to take another tact when the depression of 1893-1894 introduced a new demand for vocational training."[20] Clearly the implication is that the members of these organizations were coerced by impersonal historical forces to change their policies. Of course, Professor Butts provides not one shred of evidence for this conclusion. Moreover, we should know very well that depressions do not introduce demands. People make demands, perhaps in response to their conception of conditions imposed by events like wars and depressions, but the demands and decisions are made by people and not by some inevitable historical force. What Butts has done is to set up an explanatory scheme which allows him to apologize for the undemocratic aspects of public schooling with the excuse that they were either the inevitable result of the force of modernization or that they really do not represent mainstream American action (regardless of how wide-spread the programs or practices) because they were not actively advocated by the progressive wing of liberalism. The later claim can be maintained only so long as apologists fail to examine the primary sources.

Professor Butts' excessive reliance on secondary sources is displayed in his explanation of why working class whites and blacks supported industrial education. He begins with a quote from Samuel Hays which supposedly shows that the early progressive era was not characterized by class conflict. Hays noted that the agitation during this era was "more fundamental and more varied than an attempt by the dispossessed to curb the wealthy. The comprised a reaction not against the corporation alone but also against industrialism and the many ways in which it affected the lives of Americans."[21] Note that Hays did not reject the idea of class conflict, rather he placed it in a larger context of a struggle against the total impact of industrial capitalism and its ramifications. Nevertheless, Butts, in his very next paragraph asserts that the Hays' quote helps him explain the rise of vocational education and the acceptance of it by the working class. "Workers and farmers were concerned about making their education more useful in their jobs . . . and the poor and the immigrant sought to acquire the skills required in industrial jobs."[22] As Butts provides absolutely no documentation to support his explanation, we are left with the implication that it must follow logically from his reference to Hays. But that, of course, cannot be, for Hays argued that the thrust of the contemporary agitation was to reject industrialism. And why would those rejecting industrialism seek to match their education to industrial jobs? Professor Butts does not provide an answer. The minimum conditions for his apology to approach coherency, however, are the absence of class conflict and general acceptance of vocational education by its clients. Thus, he asserts these as fact and without any supporting evidence.

His suggestion that blacks supported industrial education is even more problematic. In the case of the support for vocational education by the immigrants and working class native whites, the primary research has yet to be completed. In the case of black acceptance, however, it is fairly conclusive. Butts' statement, again without a shred of documentation, that "the prevailing view of most black and white supporters of improved education for blacks accepted the harsh fact that education had to accommodate itself to the realities of inequality in the economic as well as the social and political worlds," is

clearly at odds with the evidence. There is substantial documentation in the works of Professor James D. Anderson which shows that most blacks considered industrial education as unequal education and training for subservience and therefore unacceptable.[23]

The problems noted above in Professor Butts' analysis of industrial education are symptomatic of his analysis of critical accounts of the American educational past. His overriding objective has been to salvage this past and the progressive-liberal ideology which has been such a central part of it from critical appraisal which might indicate a less than democratic impulse and a less than just structure of schooling. Unfortunately this kind of "ideological" reaction to much of the critical history of American education has been too prevelant. It is unfortunate because there are many problems with American education which demand attention, and intelligent attention will require an understanding of the history which has yielded the present conditions. While I believe the critical histories of the past decade represent a clear improvement in our understanding of that past, they are not sufficient, not complete and not free of error. What is desparately needed is honest criticism and sincere dialogue if we are to intelligently add to our store of understanding of the educational past. That criticism and dialogue must be based not on an apology for the past, nor an ideological commitment to the liberal or any other tradition. It must be dedicated to the pursuit of truth, and a commitment to follow that pursuit wherever it may lead.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Diane Ravitch, quoted in Hollis Caswell, "The Revisionist Historians and Educational Practice," p. 3.

[2]Ibid., p. 1.

[3]See e.g.: Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform. (Cambridge, Mass: 1968); C. J. Karier, et al, Roots of Crisis. (Chicago: 1973).

[4]Caswell, p. 2.

[5]Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas, Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis. (Chicago: 1973), pp. 161-62.

[6]Hollis Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Curriculum Development. (New York: 1935), p. 55; also pp. 53-54 where he also similarly cites the Pierce study.

[7]J. Paul Leonard, "Statement for a Symposium at a Meeting of the Society of Curriculum History," held in San Francisco, April 9, 1979, p. 1.

[8]Paul C. Violas, Training of the Urban Working Class. (Chicago: 1978), p. 56.

[9]Leonard, p. 2.

[10]R. Freeman Butts, "Assaults on a Great Idea," The Nation. April 30, 1973.

[11]Leonard, p. 4.

[12]Colin Greer, The Great School Legend. (New York: 1972).

[13]Violas, Training..., p. 193.

[14]Leonard, p. 1.

[15]Ibid., p. 2.

[16]Similar conclusions regarding black family income were drawn by Alfred L. Malabe Jr., "Teaching a Trend," The Wall Street Journal. (March 6, 1979), p. 40.

[17]Leonard, p. 4.

[18]R. Freeman Butts, "The Progressive Malaise of Revisionist Historians -- As Seen By a Progressive," pp. 9-11.

[19]Ibid., p. 11.

[20]Butts, Public Education in the United States. (New York: 1978), p. 214, emphasis added.

[21]Ibid., p. 209.

[22]Ibid., p. 210.

[23]James D. Anderson, "The Hampton Model of Normal School Industrial Education, 1868-1900," in Vincent P. Franklin and James D. Anderson, (eds.), New Perspectives in Black Educational History. (Boston: 1978).

CURRICULUM HISTORY: FLIGHT TO THE SIDELINES OR SOURCE OF NEW VITALITY?

R. V. Bullough, Jr.
University of Utah

A decade ago, in an article entitled "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum,"[1] Joseph Schwab outlined six "signs of crisis" found in fields of study that are "moribund." He labels these signs as "flights" from the "subject of the field." The fourth "flight" Schwab discusses "is to the sidelines, to the role of observer, commentator, historian, and critic of the contributions of others to the field."[2] If the recent increase in the interest in the history of curriculum can be taken as evidence of a lack of vitality in the field, particularly in the field's grounding in theory, as Schwab suggests, then the question might be asked, "What can history do to bring new vitality to the field?" That is, can history of curriculum be more than a chronicling of the rise and fall of the field? Is it possible for historians to be active in vitalizing/revitalizing a field of study?

Students of science would very likely respond in the affirmative to the last question. Scientists, unlike educators, are trained in intellectual traditions which include the necessity of coming to understand historical developments in their fields of specialization. Few educators are trained in such traditions. In part we recognize this difference as centering in differing conceptions of the nature of theory building. While it is appropriate to speak of a single theory or sets of conflicting theories dominating work in several of the scientific fields such a claim cannot be made for education except in a very limited sense. In short, educators tend not to "grow up"[3] in anything approximating a tradition.

When the history of education was dominated by a concern to document this "triumph of democracy" through the extension of schooling opportunities and the expansion of the mechanisms of schooling, it served, in a sense, a central role in vitalizing, or keeping vital, the entire field of education. Educational history helped give purpose and direction to theoretical efforts -- efforts designed to extend democracy. Many educators believed they participated in a kind of "holy cause." When, because of a variety of cultural developments, this particular view of history was accused of being extremely naive, other conceptions of history were created. Of most interest to us today are those conceptions of history which center on critical interpretations of the role of schooling in creating and perpetuating a mass society.

Revisionist history is an interesting combination of Schwab's "flight to the sidelines" as well as an important and relatively new effort to turn history into a vitalizing force. More on revisionist history will be said later. This kind of history has provided educators with some very significant understandings but it has its problems. Among these problems, in terms of history serving students of curriculum as a tool for vitalizing understandings, is that the effort to critically analyze the work of various educators often ends in an unfair placing of motives upon those educators. Somewhere in the mix of what these educators believed they were doing and what they intended to do and what actually happened a good deal of distortion occasionally creeps in. Further, what we are often treated to is an interesting chronicling of events which, while replacing the earlier "triumph of democracy" chronicling, provides us with necessarily limited understanding of why persons did what they did. Such questions are only indirectly the concern of survey and institutional histories.

What is often missing in educational histories is a focus upon "the continuing, sometimes desperate efforts of men to choose, shape, and maintain what they consider to be a proper human way of life."[4] In short, we need to people, or better phrased, "person" our history. This is especially important where the interpretations developed are grounded in a particular school of thought such as that of Marx or Habermas.[5] This is critical because the complex understandings offered by these orientations take on most meaning when viewed through the activities of beings-in-process of living life.

Obviously, I am working under the assumption, as suggested in Erik Erikson's Young Man Luther, that individuals are victims, vehicles and, in a sense, ultimately resolutions to the cultural dilemmas they experience -- dilemmas which run through and around them. It is important to keep this insight in mind because, as Habermas reminds us, in a technocratic society we tend to "reify" persons "under categories of purposive-rational action and adaptive behavior."[6] In short, we often look at persons as less than or more than persons -- villians, hucksters, heroes. We tend not to see human beings as centers of action and reaction and therefore as centers of history and history making. Where we have been victimized by the creation of mass society; where our all-too-human and irrational responses seem so senseless, the nature of our distortion and confusion is profoundly personal -- it is in

us, not just in "them."

As a field of study curriculum, particularly curriculum theory(izing), is composed of various attempts to rationalize experience — to make it sensible; to subject it to human intelligence. The central importance to curriculum workers of aims and of sources of aims of education support this view; as does our great concern for technique as control. The history of education has provided us with some very useful information about the connection between educational aims and developments within the culture at large. Unfortunately, as with behavioral scientists' concern for the average or the norm, our study of this fit is often a study "in general." It has little life. Even conflict appears neat and clean. Somewhere the peculiar and distinctive nature of an individual curriculum worker/theorist's lived experience (and that of his/her students') finds expression in the curriculum theory/program developed. The nature of this involvement requires careful and thoughtful consideration. It requires, among other things, a consideration of how the individual interprets his/her experience and makes (often in a spirit of prescription) meanings.

To get at such understandings presents several methodological problems for historians. I shall mention but three. Perhaps the central difficulty relates to the hermeneutical problem of interpretation. Is truly objective history of another person's experience possible to write? Obviously not, though clearly there is an obligation to adequately do one's historical homework when interpreting the "facts."

Some time ago Martin Duberman wrote a piece entitled the "Historian as Ghost." Too often, he reminds us, the historian works very hard to maintain his ghosthood. Because of the nature of persons-centered history, which is personally and profoundly dialogical, that is, written history is seen as the product of interaction between historian and the object of his study, it is essential that the historian materialize himself. Only a limited understanding of a dialogue is possible when one of the participants' part in the discourse is masked. The historian must take off the sheet of his anonymity and reveal, as best as his self-awareness permits him, the nature of the concerns that brought him to study who and what he is studying. What is it that is of such personal importance to an historian that he is willing to sacrifice innumerable hours of labor and engage in considerable personal agony to make a public statement about someone or something?

History writing is a profoundly personal affair. Interaction between the historian's life and that of his object of study provides the medium through which understanding flows. A kind of communion develops between history-makers — the historian and his subject -- a communion similar to that which develops between persons committed to understanding one another deeply, richly and empathetically. Erich Fromm gives some insight into the nature of coming to such person-to-person understandings when he states:

> How can I see the other if I am filled with myself? To be filled with oneself means to be filled with one's own image, with one's greed, or with one's anxiety . . . Indeed, I need to be myself in order to see the other. How could I understand his fear, his sadness, his aloneness, his hope, or love? If I cannot mobilize my own human experience, mobilize it and engage myself with my fellow man, I might come to know a great deal <u>about</u> him (knowledge "in general"), but I shall never know <u>him</u>. To be open is the condition to enable me to become filled with him, to become soaked with him, as it were, But <u>I</u> must be <u>I</u>. . .

And so the historian must be himself/herself; a kind of spokesperson through which the past and future unite in the present. In this process new understandings; new history is created.

Obviously an historian will desire to enter into such communion with some persons and not with others. Generally we seek out persons who share something special with us — perhaps the nature of our struggle to make life meaningful. The point is that we choose our "friends" carefully and, if we are to remain friendly to the end (of a writing project for example) there must be something in it for the historian. One such "something" comes as a result of totally submerging oneself in the other; by feeling empathy for the other. In this process the historian's own life meanings become increasingly clear and enriched -- while, at the same time these meanings are used to come to understand the other. The difference between the other and the historian is a blurry one and, at times, confusing. But, such is always the case where true dialogue has taken place -- where one person's ideas begin and end is uncertain and, furthermore, relatively unimportant.

A second problem is that of determining what primary historical resources are useful. In this regard personal letters written to friends, stories of the person's behavior, recordings of informal speeches and reminiscences of friends and enemies are all essential compliments to published works. Obviously this problem shifts when the object of our study is presently living — but the problems of interpretation and data gathering remain. One difference, as I presently see it, between

traditional history and persons-centered history in terms of data gathering, is found in what is ultimatley selected as being important. Often what appear to be relatively insignificant events in an individual's life, when considered from a traditional historical point of view, have great importance in terms of what they have to say about how he creates (created) meaning. Naturally it is vitally important that the context within which an individual lived and worked be considered. It is in this context that an individual's effort to create meaning becomes significant -- just as it is through an individual's life that we can come to understand the context.

Perhaps an example will help clarify my meaning. During World War I Boyd Bode expressed in a letter to his close friend Max Otto[8] a little irritation at what he perceived to be the unwillingness of some immigrant groups to learn English which, interestingly enough, he called an "ordinary obligation of citizenship." The importance of this relatively minor episode is found in that it is a significant indication of Bode's own personal concern to identify with what he perceived as being truly American. And, as most of you know, this effort, that is, the effort to realize the democratic ideals of America, dominated, almost in a religious sense, Bode's work in education.

A third set of problems found in writing persons-centered history relates to how the historian is to communicate the spirit of the individual's (or individuals') quest which is the focus of study. In a book on Boyd Bode entitled, Democracy in Education, Boyd H. Bode,[9] I explored the use of dialogues. The reason for using dialogues is perhaps best expressed by imagining what Plato's work would have conveyed about Socrates had he decided to write a straight descriptive, intellectual history, or a biography. Though much work in this area needs to be done, it seems to me dialogues lend themselves well to enlivening history. An individual's humor, complete with colloquial phrasing; his/her subtle twists of logic in argumentation are important aspects of understanding not only how an individual went about making meaning but also how that individual went about influencing others who share his/her historical context. The "how" of an argument is often more important than the "what."

What does this have to do with the possible role and responsibility of curriculum history to vitalize or revitalize the field? Certainly, doing history does provide disillusioned curriculum workers with something to do and is, in this sense, a "flight to the sidelines." But this is not necessarily the case.

Revisionist history begins to get at the problem of vitalizing education by suggesting that there are a number of significant questions, of importance to curriculum workers, that have generally been ignored by the mainstream of the field. These questions include the following: "Whose interests does this curriculum scheme or organizational scheme serve?" "Who or what is or has been excluded from participation?" "What is the role of ideology in education?" And so on. These are not necessarily questions that lead to revitalizing a field as much as they lead to a reconstruction or a reconceptualization of a field and of its area of concern.

For curriculum the focus must be upon the nature of human experience -- private and collective. Persons must always be the center of our concern. And, as I have suggested, this requires that along with traditional and revisionist histories we develop histories that focus primarily upon persons and their struggles to create "what they consider to be a proper human way of life." Such histories will raise other questions (it will also ask questions very similar to those asked by revisionists and traditional historians but consider them from different angles) that compliment and enhance those asked by revisionists and traditional historians: "What role has personality played in theory adoption?" "What kinds of personal/cultural concerns lead to what kinds of curriculum theories?" And so on.

Curriculum history need not be a flight to the sidelines -- though it can very easily become such a flight. It can be a source of useful data for understanding where we have been, where we are, and where we ought to be. It can help clarify the nature of the traditions of scholarship, complete with role models, which have existed in the field. It can help us better understand the "community" aspects of educational change. And, at the very least, it can help vitalize/revitalize the field in a most obvious way, by helping to direct our attention where it belongs -- on persons and on the nature of their lived experience.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum in Curriculum and the Cultural Revolution. David E. Purpel and Maurice Belanger (eds.) (Berkeley: McCutchan Pub., Corp., 1972), pp. 79-99.

[2]Ibid., p. 81.

[3]I do not mean to suggest there have never been any intellectual traditions within which professional educators work. Certainly there have been and still are several. Generally, however, educators do not see themselves as participating in any particular intellectual traditions.

[4]Maxine Greene, "The Professional Significance of History of Education," in Understanding History of Education. Robert Sherman and Joseph Kirschner (eds.) (Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman Pub. Co., Inc. 1976), p. 53.

[5]Habermas' view of history is that it is essentially irrational. It is irrational because the human drive for increased freedom and intelligence (meaning) is distorted, controlled and frustrated by various blocks built into the socio-economic system. This drive for meaning and increased freedom continues to express itself and in doing so irrational behavior is often the result. And, of course, the system itself is profoundly irrational. See, for example, part one in Habermas' Legitimation Crisis (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973).

[6]Jurgen Habermas, Toward a Rational Society. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), p. 106.

[7]Erich Fromm, Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962), p. 151.

[8]Letter, Boyd H. Bode to Max Otto, August 1, 1918, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Archives, Otto Papers.

[9]General Hall, Inc., 1979.

CONCEPTIONS OF THE HISTORY OF THE CURRICULUM

J. Stephen Hazlett
The University of Texas at Austin

In sampling the literature on curriculum, one finds the assertion that curriculum workers are an ahistorical lot. With varying degrees of emphasis, a number of authors have made this point, including Herbert Kliebard, Mary Louise Seguel, Dwayne Huebner, Arno Bellack, B. O. Smith, O. L. Davis, and Barry Franklin.[1] The assertion sometimes takes the form of a plaint accomplished by the hope for remedy. The formation of this Society for the Study of Curriculum History presumably attests to the seriousness of the concern and to the intent to take positive action.

In one sense, however, I must disagree that professional curriculum workers in the United States in this century have assumed an ahistorical posture. To the contrary, it seems to me that they have been acutely historical-minded. Indeed, it may be argued that a sense of history has shaped and guided the curriculum to a considerable extent. Two reasons underlie this judgment. First, American educators and much of the public tend to like education very closely with specific personal and social "outcomes"; they look for direct payoffs and are easily seduced by proposals which promise to produce them more readily. The second and related reason is the commonplace premise that the school curriculum is or should be responsive to the society and its movements, trends, "needs," and aspirations. Failure to respond to contextual exigencies, however diagnosed, is usually treated as an egregious shortcoming, and this is as true for those who are critical of the current order, such as the social reconstructionists of the 1930s or the reconceptualists of the 1970s, as it is for those who seek to conform to the society as it is presently constituted. Thus insofar as they are predicated on temporal perceptions, the normative and technical prescriptions of curriculum workers are necessarily imbued with historicity.

The nature of the historical-mindedness of curriculum workers would make an interesting study. I think that it would reveal certain characteristic traits of the group which could help clarify the field. Only a few admittedly tentative impressions can be mentioned here. There is a tendency in curriculum discourse for history to move dramatically and abruptly from one qualitatively distinct period to another. Change is more commonly revolutionary than evolutionary. The educational past is frequently considered to have been relatively stable and qualitatively deficient. Rugg's contributions to the NSSE's 26th yearbook exemplifies this bias as does Foshay's first chapter in his Curriculum for the 70's.[2] Then comes the present, full of sound and fury. Almost invariably, it is an unsettling time of crisis, which challenges curriculum workers either to catch up with society or to adapt quickly to some precipitate veer. Crisis breeds a sense of urgency. Action must be taken, and it must be taken soon. Many of the reports, conference papers, articles, and books I consulted evidence this orientation.[3]

In examining this historical moment, some writers on curriculum curiously act as if they were reading tea leaves rather than deliberately and self-critically attempting to interpret a complex array of particulars. Sometimes their readings are so vague and abstract as to make it difficult to see a logical connection with proposed curriculum alterations, or their assertions are so categorical that they leave no room for alternative interpretations, or their statements imply that educational directives are lodged in history itself. I offer two illustrations. In Modern Educational Theories. Boyd Bode, following Dewey, states that "educational problems and movements are a reflection of social changes." Citing Dewey, he refers to "'the democratic upheaval,'" "'a demand for political equality,'" and "'a more profound aspiration towards an equality of intellectual and moral opportunity and development,'" and then summarizes by saying that "we are shifting from an aristocratic to a democratic level."[4] On the basis of this slender reed he recommends curricular changes in some detail, after which he compounds the confusion by arguing that a "humanized" curriculum must not reflect but "anticipate the spirit and outlook of the social order that is to be."[5] Foshay, in the work previously mentioned, conducts his argument in a similar manner. His statements about past and present are cast as unequivocal dicta, and he buttresses his curriculum agenda by claiming that educational imperatives are themselves the "product" of society.[6] It would appear that history issues orders, that it speaks and speaks imperiously. The irony, however, is that while Foshay in 1970 was prophesying a curriculum of self-awareness others were divining more accountability and behavioral objectification. My conclusion is that in examples like these the use of history is more expedient than judicious.

I have argued that the curriculum field is historically aware, but I would also agree that it is ahistorical in the sense that it lacks a well-proportioned historiography. The

size of this lacuna is unclear, however, because the boundaries and content of the field are imprecise, and I gather that there are differing opinions about what is legitimately curriculum history as opposed to educational history.[7] Nevertheless, the question remains why there have not been more historical studies of curriculum-making. The question has added interest if one accepts that curriculum workers are historical-minded, as I believe them to be. Technical and material considerations are not obstacles. The writing of credible history is certainly exacting but it does not demand arcane technical expertise.[8] The number of topics awaiting investigation is indefinitely large. In going through Tanner and Tanner's text, itself a historically oriented work, one finds not only many viable subjects but also problems that have been at least partially defined for research purposes.[9] Moreover, several conceptual bearings are already sketched,[10] and significant levels of curriculum activity can be readily demarcated.

Concerning the latter, the nature and sources of curriculum thought could withstand greater description and analysis. The middle-level area of curriculum discourse, projects, planning, and prescriptions also begs for attention. The "lived" curriculum of the school and classroom is a level of inquiry that has suffered the most neglect. As a group, historians have shied away from the particular school because they have assumed that educational history is deductive and that extant records are insufficient. On both counts the assumption is unwarrantable. French historians associated with the Annales movement are now demonstrating that it is possible to get closer to the inner workings of schools and classrooms than previously believed.[11] Their findings indicate that much of our conventional wisdom about schooling in the past is a patchwork of anachronisms and reifications and that our understandings of school-society relations are inadequate and simplistic. The approach they follow, however, is rigorous; it demands great patience and arduous labor. But if they are succeeding in uncovering a great deal of information about school life in the 17th century, we should be able to succeed as well or better for the 19th and 20th centuries. A major contention of the annalistes since Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch has been that lack of knowledge of the past is to a considerable extent the result of the simple failure to inquire.

That these three levels — plus a fourth dealing with the dynamics of the curriculum process — offer extensive possibilities for investigation is not news. So what is the problem? Where lies the impediment to writing curriculum history?

I suggest that the answer rests in the nature of the curriculum field, defined as a professional endeavor engaged in by the professoriat. As such, curriculum does not bear the marks of a field of disciplined inquiry in a formal sense. It is, more characteristically, a field of practical, normative activity carried on with urgency in a crisis atmosphere. If this be true, then it follows that the intellectual orientation, role specifications, and reward structure of the enterprise would not encourage contemplative undertakings whose goal is to know rather than to do. These undertakings may be nice, even laudable, but they are not high priorities. Keep in mind that curriculum leaders early in the century gave a pejorative connotation to the term "academic," and more recently one prominent figure, although admitting that curriculum history was "desperately" needed, warned that it should not become a distracting preoccupation.[12] Under the sway of this type of professional mentality, that curriculum history has not been vigorously pursued is understandable. And those who have pushed for historical research have usually pled their cause in the name of utilitarian benefit. I do not recall anyone pressing the issue primarily on the grounds of historical curiosity. As one who inhabits that outland called foundations of education, I am firmly convinced that as long as contextual and analytical studies must meet the test of immediate practicality, they will continue to be marginal.

The observation that curriculum work is preeminently a practical, valuative activity to some extent clarifies other characteristics of the field. Curriculum is unsure of its boundaries, it suffers from chronic definitional ambiguity (there is not even a standard nomenclature for its members), it persistently stumbles over the notion of theory, its treatment of contradictions tends toward expediency, its agenda is cyclical rather than linear, and though always moving, it shows few signs of development. Generally recognized fields of study share these traits — none is a pristine model of order and clarity — but they do not exhibit them in the same degree. They have been obliged, as a minimum, to arrive at working definitions and solutions in order to get on with their business, communicate, and justify their existence. Curriculum has apparently not been under the same obligation; otherwise it, too, would have taken these steps. But the curriculum field has been in existence for over half a century, and although there are concerns about the state of its health, it still functions and plays a role in education. This fact implies that it can and does maintain itself without the constitutional supports customarily associated with communities of disciplined inquiry.

What, then, do curriculum workers do? A plausible reply is that they must prepare curricula for the schools and show others how to do likewise, and indeed many of them do. But my information argues that the preparation of curriculum materials is not a functional necessity for the field. Curriculum construc-

tion obviously went on long before the first professors of curriculum appeared on the scene, the founders of the field did not think of themselves mainly as curriculum makers and recognized that the bulk of this work was done elsewhere, and a 1963 NEA report did not identify the curriculum professoriat as a major influence on curriculum design nor did it recommend that it should be.[13] Many agencies take part in the actual making of curriculum; professional curriculum workers are only one of them and not necessarily the most salient.

So, again, what do they do? If as a group they are, functionally speaking, too practical for their academic colleagues and too academic for practitioners in the schools, what is their mission? In light of the situation described, it seems that one of the important tasks of the curriculum field since its inception has been to be the bearer of symbols. More than scholarly inquiry or the exercise of technical expertise, curriculum workers have been a vehicle within education for the rhetorical expression of the values, sentiments, concerns, and aspirations of the society. Insofar as the nation tends to reduce political, social, and economic problems to educational ones and claims to expect schools to cure present ills and provide for a brighter tomorrow for individuals and the collectivity, this role is of great significance. That a body of certified professionals, who are ostensibly linked with what is taught in schools, formally and ritually discourses on the concerns and ideals of the moment and prescribes desirable courses of action has meaning in itself. Such activity may have little instrumental and noetic value which is susceptible of measurement, but that is really beside the point. Condensation or ceremonial symbols are not aimed at objective referents. Instead they speak to the emotions and psychological states and in so doing they fulfill several purposes. They emotionally assist people attempting to cope with an ambiguous and complex set of circumstances; they in this way "clarify" psychologically, if not rationally. The expression of symbols also activates people to do battle or, as the case may be, it assuages their fears and anxieties. Moreover, when public officials engage in symbolic rhetoric, they personify and concretize emotional issues, thereby offering themselves as heroes or scapegoats, depending on the dispositions of their listeners.[14]

This conception of curriculum activity has drawbacks, but it does throw new light on some of the peculiar traits of the field. It has been noted that the field originated as part of a reform movement at a time when there was considerable doubt about the promise of democracy.[15] Curriculum has not lost this reformist zeal, and educators generally have been fond of posing as the guarantors of democratic ideals. In this respect the birth of the profession was a symbol of amelioration. Curriculum disourse, hortatory and filled with slogans, assumed and has kept a form that is congruent with symbolic expressiveness. And the wide swings of the curriculum pendulum between foci of attention, the frequent uncritical sensitivity of curriculum workers to what they perceive to be the demands of the "real" world, the desire to accommodate numerous influences even at the price of logical contradiction, and the relative disregard for the evaluation of innovation also become more understandable from a symbolic perspective.

One difficulty with symbolic activity, however, is that it is rarely justified in its own terms. To say something is "merely" symbolic detracts from its efficacy. Those who bear and express symbols must seek functional justification for their roles. This point is relevant, I think, to the apparently continuing concern about identity in the curriculum field. To the extent that curriculum work is expressive rather than instrumental, this concern cannot easily be resolved and may become more acute if field-based teacher education directed by the teacher education centers becomes more prevalent.

Although I am not pledged to symbolic analysis, I do believe that it has something to offer to the historical study of education. Functionalist approaches are unquestionably useful, but they do not account well for many phenomena. And if it is true that the production model and the utilitarian criterion have limited the intellectual framework of curriculum workers, as Kliebard claims,[16] then perhaps an examination of the expressive value of schooling and curriculum is in order.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Herbert Kliebard, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," in Edmund C. Short, ed., Educational Comment 1970: A Search for Valid Content for Curriculum Courses. (Toledo, 1970), pp. 31-41; Mary Louise Seguel, The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years. (New York, 1966), pp. 1-6; Dwayne Huebner, "The Moribund Curriculum Field: Its Wake Our Work," Curriculum Inquiry 6:2 (1976), 155; Arno Bellack, "History of Curriculum Thought and Practice," Review of Education Research 39:3 (June, 1969): 283-292; B. O. Smith, Reply to Huebner Paper, Curriculum Inquiry 6:2 (1976): 168; O. L. Davis, Jr. Perspectives on Curriculum Development. 1976 ASCD Yearbook (Washington, 1976), pp. 1-15; Barry M. Franklin, "Curriculum History: Its Nature and Boundaries," Curriculum Inquiry 7:1 (1977): 67-69.

[2]Harold Rugg, "A Century of Curriculum-Construction in American Schools," in Guy Montrose Whipple, ed., The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum-Construction, Part I, Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. (Bloomington, Ill., 1926), p. 3-116; Arthur W. Foshay, Curriculum for the 70's: An Agenda for Invention. (Washington, D. C., 1970), pp. 3-24.

[3]See, for example, William Van Till, ed., Curriculum: Quest for Relevance. (Boston, 1974); William F. Pinar, ed., Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution, and Curriculum Theory. (Berkeley, 1974); Elliot W. Eisner, ed., Confronting Curriculum Reform. (Boston, 1971); and Dwayne Huebner, ed., A Reassessment of the Curriculum. (New York, 1964).

[4]Boyd H. Bode, Modern Educational Theories. (New York, 1927), pp. 25-26.

[5]Ibid., p. 40.

[6]Foshay, p. 5.

[7]Franklin, p. 67-69; O. L. Davis, Jr. "The Nature and Boundaries of Curriculum History," Curriculum Inquiry 7:2 (1977): 157-168.

[8]J. H. Hexter, The History Primer. (New York, 1971).

[9]Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice. (New York, 1975).

[10]I am referring here to the work of Franklin, Kliebard, Seguel, Decker, Walker, and Michael Apple.

[11]See, for example, Roger Chartier, Marie-Madeleine Compere, and Dominique Julia, L'Education en France du XVI au XVIII siecle. (Paris, 1976) and Jean de Viguerie, Une oeuvre d'education sous l'ancien regime. (Paris, 1976).

[12]B. O. Smith, op. cit.

[13]Seguel, op. cit.; National Education Association, Deciding What to Teach. (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 179-214.

[14]Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics. (Urbana, Ill., 1964); David K. Cohen and Bella H. Rosenberg, "Functions and Fantasies: Understanding Schools in Capitalist America," History of Education Quarterly. 17:2 (1977): 113-137.

[15]Kliebard, op. cit.

[16]Ibid.

AN ELUSIVE QUARRY: ON THE TRAIL OF CURRICULUM HISTORY

O. L. Davis, Jr.
George L. Mehaffy
University of Texas at Austin

The history of the field of curriculum remains largely unwritten. The fragmentary efforts to document the peaks and valleys of our past are honored as much for their entry into this barren landscape as for the brilliance of their analyses (See, for example, Seguel, 1966; Walker, 1977). Nevertheless, the pioneering efforts underway are miniscule compared to the enormity of the task that lies before us. Our past must be explored and understood, and we must be the ones to make that journey. To leave the task to others is to abdicate our own responsibilities.

Those who heed the call for more adequate curriculum history appear to be faced immediately with a problem of definition: What constitutes curriculum history? Franklin (1977) and Davis (1977), in an exchange which began with the publication of the 1976 ASCD yearbook (Davis, 1976) examined several alternate understandings. Curriculum history, according to one position, must focus on the course of study, the plans made prior to instruction, as the basic artifact of curriculum past. Some have concentrated attention on deliberations about curriculum policy. One new interpretation suggests that the curriculum field can best be understood historically as the formation and development of an occupational group (e.g., Ponder and Doyle, 1977). A second major new interpretation of the curriculum field proposes that curriculum functions largely in a symbolic capacity (Hazlett, 1979, 1979b). A recent case study of the 1950s - 1960s disciplines era has employed both the occupational and the symbolic perspectives (Mehaffy, 1979).

Regardless of the interpretation, one thing is obvious. The curriculum field cannot be divorced from the major educational figures who participated in its growth and development. Individuals such as Bobbitt, Hopkins, Caswell, Rugg, Miel, Saylor, Smith, and Stratemeyer acknowledge the curriculum field as the focus of their professional life. All wrote and contributed to the formation of the field as it is known today. As such, the curriculum field is more than just written documents, courses of study, articles and books. It is, as well, the story of the personal journeys of its participants.

Until recently, the individual participation of leading national figures remained undocumented. Most of the accounts were left unwritten, remaining only in the memory of individual participants. The loss of priceless individual accounts accompanied the death of many of the most prominent early figures in the curriculum field. Occasionally, a dissertation has focused on one or several well-known curriculumists (e.g., DeWulf, 1962; Hansen, 1971; Ponder, 1974; Seguel, 1966). Most of these efforts have been uneven in conception and quality, not systematic or widespread, and, except for Seguel's study, largely unknown and uncited.

The absence of available sources for research renders any historical inquiry impotent. The simple fact is that, now, sources for the study of curriculum history are not only in disarray, they exist in random anonymity or have disappeared more through indifference than by design. No collection has concentrated sources in curriculum history. The need to gather the primary evidential sources for the curriculum field has been pointed out, but archival collection, for the most part, has been slow.

Oral history, recently popularized, captures and preserves accounts otherwise not available. Oral history is the systematic collection and preservation of recollections and reminiscences of individuals about their past, their entire lives or special events or times in which they participated or observed. It is an intensely personal document, organized and created both by the memoirist and the interviewer. Its anecdotes breathe life into the silent record of past events, highlights individual relationships, and creates the personal fabric for the understanding of a specific life in its times.

Growing largely out of concerns both for more curriculum history and the preservation of material potentially lost, we began the Oral History Program at the College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin, in 1976. The UT Austin Oral History Program continues to collect interviews with major national figures in the field of curriculum as one element of a larger effort in the field of education (Davis and Mehaffy, 1977). Our focus is guided by our own perceptions of the field, by our meager resources, and by the availability of and willingness to participate by memoirists. To date, we have interviewed 37 individuals whose contributions to the field of curriculum are substantial (see list, appendix A). We are expanding our list of those to be interviewed almost daily. As time and resources permit, many other individuals will be added. We should also note that our program also encompasses a major effort in social studies education (some 25 individuals,

over 100 hours) and in reading (seven individuals, some 30 hours). We have also accepted for deposit over 50 interviews of local educators.

Nevertheless, our limited beginning appears impressive, especially to us. We have collected over 132 hours of interviews in the curriculum field. As our materials are indexed and made available to scholars, this collection will become a major resource for study of the history of curriculum. Some of the collected material has already been utilized in articles and dissertations (e.g., Davis, 1978, 1979; Kraus, 1977; Mehaffy, 1979) and in research underway at other universities.

The collected interviews are not at all random discussions. They are highly structured interviews which require extensive preparation about the memoirists and the larger milieu in which they acted. The interviewer, however, must have more than an adequate understanding of events and people, he must also be skillful in eliciting that information from the interviewee. The combination of background preparation and skillful interview technique challenges although does not eliminate charges of superficiality which occasionally are laid at the feet of oral history practitioners.

The document which is created from an oral history interview presents unique and often formidable difficulties for the historian. A major problem is use of the tapes themselves. While in an audio state, an oral history record (on tape) is relatively inexpensive to produce and even to duplicate. Transformation of the tape record to a written document, however, incurs large costs which we have been unable to assume. Yet, left in only an audio format, an oral history interview of seven or eight hours is cumbersome to all but the most dedicated scholar. We determined that out goal would be to make the collection accessible, even if we did not have the resources available for transcription. Therefore, we use an audio index system which employs the development of a stereo cassette tape.

The originally recorded interview is duplicated on one track of a cassette tape and then is paired to the record track which contains time counts from zero to thirty minutes, at fifteen second intervals. With the addition of the time count, each tape can be indexed according to events, people, or topics and a finding guide can be prepared for each interview. Using a stereo playback machine, and listening only to the time track, a specific section of tape may be located quickly. After locating the appropriate section, the time track may be switched off and the interview track heard as specific topics are researched. This procedure does not overcome the disadvantage of listening to the tape recorded interview (in preference to reading a transcript). It has two specific advantages, however. It preserves and honors the audio nature of the oral interview itself, and also constitutes practical access to the tapes when the costs of transcription are prohibitive.

Subjectivity in the Creation of the Oral History Memoir

One charge is sometimes made of the oral history is that it is subjective and thereby distorts the true record as a function of the interviewer asking only what he wishes to know about. Oral history collection is subjective, but, competently engaged, it is not capricious and does not distort knowingly. The charge of subjectivity is willingly acknowledged. Bias and distortion are always present as long as human beings are participants. Bias is never eliminated, only recognized. Two major forms of subjective bias we recognize in our collection effort.

One, memoirists themselves are subjective. They do not remember everything. They have remembered selectively for a host of personal reasons. Too, passage of time dims the accuracy of memory. They also edit their memory during the course of the interview. That is, they decide how much detail, how intense the feeling, and the extent of comprehensiveness they will reveal both for the record and to the interviewer. Quite likely for some individuals, the oral history interview is an opportunity for them to create the record as they want it to be known and as they desire themselves to be remembered. The subjectivity of the memoirist appears to be very complex and must be acknowledged.

Even so, subjectivity, by itself, does not define accuracy. One's fidelity to truth -- as remembered -- may well be honest. It can never be complete.

Two, the interviewer is a party to the creation of the oral history document. The extent of his preparation and his skill in interviewing are only two obvious elements relating to his own subjectivity, to his own bias. We recognize that such bias or subjectivity is present in the questions asked, those from the interview. Moreover, a larger bias is present as a product of the people chosen for interviews and the concerns (e.g., ideas, projects, fields) selected for archival attention.

Oral History As Source

Oral history is misunderstood as history. It is a source, not an account. It is evidence, not interpretation. An example from military history helps illustrate the issue. It comes from David Irving's very readable The Trail of the Fox, a brilliant biography of Field Marshall Erwin Rommel.

Rommel was an untiring chronicler. He kept a personal diary and wrote his wife long letters almost daily throughout World War II. These two traditional written sources, diaries and letters, were relied upon heavily by Irving as he drew his portrait of "The Desert Fox." Yet, Irving also consulted those individuals who knew Rommel intimately and who were his daily comrades in arms. He discovered, not untypically, that Rommel consciously and deliberately distorted his own recorded history. For example, he asked his adjutant one time what else he might add to embellish his record. At the same time, those around him recalled the elaborate efforts Rommel undertook to publicize his own victories and to discredit the efforts of others, both generals on the battlefront and on the German General Staff.

The point here is simple. Oral history, like other historical evidence, is marked by the process which produces it. Oral history is one source, often an indispensable evidence. It is not, in itself, history. Oral history, like other sources, must be subjected to the evidentiary canons integral to the discipline of history. So judged, oral history can contribute to accounts and to interpretation. By itself, oral history is not history.

Thus, the subjectivity and bias of oral history does not render this source more useful or less valuable than other sources. The oral history document must be treated like other documents.

The Personal Nature of Oral History

Much of oral history's uniqueness lies in its deliberateness and its personalness. An oral history account most commonly is produced some years after the events of its concern. Many memoirists, indeed, are surprised to be chosen for an interview because they believe they have little of significance to relate. The oral history memoir, conceived by someone other than the memoirist, is a deliberately created document. In our personal experience, trips from Austin to Santa Barbara, to Bloomington, and to Rowe were at our initiative and based on our rationale. In the absence of our plans and actions, most of our oral history memoirs would not have been collected. These oral history documents were deliberately created.

The oral history memoir, further, tells about oneself -- actions, ideas, relationships, and feelings. Studied detachment so characteristic of reports is seldom present. The personality of the interviewee dominates the account. Most people we have interviewed have seldom written a personal memoir, and they probably would not. On the other hand, the oral history interview provides a setting in which they can -- to the extent they desire -- talk about what they know well -- themselves, their ideas, and their sensitivities. The oral history document is intensely personal. It illuminates dark corners left untouched, provides leads to people and documents commonly ignored or unknown, and reminds us constantly that every life is one of hope and dreams, of expectations and accomplishments, and of triumph and despair.

Future Direction and Possibilities

Using oral history requires evidence beyond the recorded personal account. Other documents add perspective and suggest interpretation as well as yield new meanings from the richness of the oral narrative. That other sources are required does not diminish the critical importance of oral history. The oral history narrative is a document, in all likelihood, that otherwise would not exist. It is precious precisely because nothing else substitutes for it.

Our goal is to grasp further than we believed we could reach. We desire to build a collection of oral history documents that will facilitate the writing of more accurate histories of curriculum. Our past work continually informs our plans for future interviews. As oral history efforts go, our program is very young, yet, evidence accumulated already has enabled inquiry to penetrate obscured meanings and ignored events in the field. The promise of the collection builds with each added memoir and with each new use.

The emphasis on archival developed underscores another responsibility of the Program. Most of the collection, in all probability, will be used by scholars who did not collect the interview. Without doubt, the interviews will be all too silent on issues of importance to future researchers. Hours of interviews may be lengthy stretches of barren trivia to some; they may yield a treasure to another. That our Program is aware of these probabilities is to remind interviewers to increased care and to informed, thoughtful conversation. In this, as in all matters of history, completeness remains elusive. Construction of these oral history documents, on the other hand, is a self consciously future-oriented enterprise.

Curriculum history continues to elude current efforts at understanding. These conditions likely will persist even against increased attention by more individuals. Yet, the veil of ignorance now worn by our field peels back bit by bit. A heightened interest in penetrating that mask sustains a growing band of historians of the field. Our own work in oral history, we hope, adds new and heretofore unavailable resources to the quest.

The beginning made requires continuance. We solicit from our colleagues in the curriculum field suggestions of individuals to be interviewed and of possibilities for those in-

terviews conducted by others for deposit in the collection. We invite others to use the oral history memoirs now gathered together in the collection. Through continuing cooperation, our common quarry will become less elusive.

APPENDIX A

CURRICULUM FIELD MEMOIRISTS IN THE ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM CENTER FOR HISTORY OF EDUCATION THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, SPRING 1980

William M. Alexander
Robert H. Anderson
George A. Beauchamp
Hollis L. Caswell
John E. Codwell
Edgar Dale
Harold D. Drummond
Arthur W. Foshay
Jane Franseth
Alexander Frazier
Jack R. Frymier
John D. Greene
L. Thomas Hopkins
Rose Lammel
Alvin D. Loving, Sr.
James B. Macdonald
Alice Miel
A. Harry Passow
Philip H. Phenix
Chandos Reid Rice
James W. Reynolds
J. Galen Saylor
Joseph J. Schwab
Harold G. Shane
B. Othanel Smith
Maycie K. Southall
Harold Spears
William O. Stanley
Drew C. Tinsley
David Turney
I. Keith Tyler
Ralph W. Tyler
Glenys Unruh
William Van Til
Fred Wilhelms

REFERENCES

Davis, O. L., Jr., ed. Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976.

Davis, O. L., Jr. "The Nature and Boundaries of Curriculum History," Curriculum Inquiry. 7 (Summer 1977): 157-168.

Davis, O. L., Jr. and Mahaffy, George L. Oral History in Education: A Beginning. Austin, Texas: Center for the History of Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1977.

Davis, O. L., Jr. "Curriculum Leaders over Fifty Years: A Reputational Study." Unpublished paper presented at the Professors of Curriculum Meeting, San Francisco, 1978.

Davis, O. L., Jr. "Curriculum as Supervision: The Professor as Conceptualizer of his Field." Unpublished paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco, 1979.

Default, B. G. The Educational Ideas of John Franklin Bobbitt. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. St. Louis: Washington University, 1962.

Doyle, Walter. "Education for All: The Triumph of Professionalism," Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976. Edited by O. L. Davis, Jr. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976.

Franklin, Barry M. "Curriculum History: Its Nature and Boundaries," Curriculum Inquiry. 7 (Spring 1977): 67-69.

Hansen, J. Merrell. Kimball Wiles' Contributions to Curriculum and Instruction: An Analysis Within An Historical Context. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.

Hazlett, J. Stephen. "Conceptions of Curriculum History," Curriculum Inquiry. 9:129-135; Summer 1979.

Hazlett, J. Stephen. "A Symbolic Approach to What Curriculum Professors Do." Unpublished paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco, 1979 (b).

Irving, David. The Trail of the Fox. New York: Avon Books, 1977.

Kraus, Larry L. Curriculum, Public Policy, and Criticism: An Analysis of the Controversies Surrounding: A Course of Study. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1979.

Mahaffy, George L. Symbolic and Occupational Explanations of Curriculum Discourse: An Exploration of Curriculum Theory during the Disciplines Era. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1979.

Ponder, Gerald A. Conflict, Collectivism, and Consensus: A Historical Analysis of Social Reconstructionist Curriculum Theories. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

Segual, Mary L. The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years. Teachers College Press, 1966.

Walker, Decker. "Straining to Lift Ourselves." Curriculum Theory Network. 5 (1975): 3-25.

RESEARCH INTO THE CURRICULUM, 1918-1938: HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WORK OF THE FIRST GENERATION[1]

Kate Strickland
University of Texas at San Antonio

It is difficult, as Leonard Berk noted, to justify the study of history to a field whose preoccupations are practical and focused on the improvement of school practice (Berk, 1978). When one is dealing with a field which has not yet settled the question of the role and value of research in the construction of curriculum, professionalizing the need for a history of curriculum research is necessary if the curriculum field is to ever pursue what Walter Monroe (1925) called the ultimate purpose of educational research -- the discovery of procedures, rules, and principles relating to various aspects of education. Then, too, the desire to search for the traditions of the field, or to seek a new perspective on the persistent questions which face the curriculum worker might also be proposed as logical bases for documenting the results of research into the general curriculum.

If these thoughts form the basis for an acceptable rationale, then the search for a history of curriculum research must begin in 1918, for that is the year which marked not only the birth of the curriculum field but also the beginning of "The Scientific Movement in Education." It was, as Kliebard so aptly described it, a vintage year for the curriculum field. The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education made their appearance, and Franklin Bobbitt published the first full length book on the curriculum. Inglis contributed Principles of Secondary Education, and William Kilpatrick authored the much reprinted "Project Method". It was, moreover, the first year of what was destined to be a major period of interest in and work on the curriculum. Between 1918 and 1938 the junior high school concept spread across the nation, accompanied by a curriculum revision movement which left no level of schooling untouched. A new emphasis was placed on the statement of goals and objectives in a curriculum plan, and no less than three alternative curriculum designs were proposed. Within the traditional subject-discipline design social usage became the new basis for selecting content, and broad field and inter-disciplinary courses made their appearance. Ralph Tyler began his epic work on evaluation in this twenty year period, and with its publication (Smith and Tyler, 1942) the four basic steps in modern curriculum-making -- setting goals and objectives, selecting and organizing learning experiences, planning for instruction, and evaluation -- were accepted at least in principle by most schoolmen.

The birth of the curriculum field coincided with a new emphasis upon educational research, as this first generation of curriculum specialists found themselves in the midst of what contemporary authors defined as nothing less than a revolution in educational thought. Almost overnight, or so it seemed, literally thousands of teachers, administrators, and university professors began to collect data of all sorts to aid in the decision-making process. Researchers queried experts, tallied deficiencies, identified minimum essentials, surveyed school, studied retardation and elimination, engaged in activity analysis, and developed questionnaires on every topic imaginable. The number of studies published in all areas of education grew from less than fifty prior to 1918 to over 3,000 by 1927; doctoral dissertations increased from fifty-three a year to 986 a year in the same period (Monroe, 1928). The research effort continued almost unabated into the next decade, and the National Society for the Study of Education, with some pride, recognized this important change in the field of education by devoting its Thirty-seventh Yearbook (1938) to a straightforward objective description and appraisal of the results of what the Society termed "The Scientific Movement in Education."

The curriculum field was not immune to this new attitude towards educational research, and it eagerly embraced what the literature called "the scientific method." Generally defined as a desire to secure as exact information as possible to serve as the basis for practice (Freeman, 1938), the scientific method was touted by the early leaders of the curriculum field. They had great confidence, Peik was to write in the NSSE Yearbook, "in the superiority of a curriculum based on facts as to the where, why, what, and how of education" over "practices resulting from speculation, haphazard impressions, and unchallenged experience" (Peik, 1938, p. 53). Like their colleagues in other fields and the American public in general, they firmly believed in the ability of science to solve the major problems confronting the country, including those plaguing the schools. The increase in research on the general curriculum was significant, as studies on the goals, designs, planning process, and evaluation of the curriculum grew from less than ten prior to 1918 to nearly 140 by 1938.

What, then, were the characteristics of the research produced on the general curriculum[2] during the years of the Scientific Movement in Education? Are there principles to be derived from the results of these studies? Are there traditions to be discovered, new perspectives on perennial questions

to be explored, or lessons to be discovered, or lessons to be learned from the work of the first generation? A thumbnail sketch reveals that nearly three-fourths of the 137 studies represented the single research contribution of the author to the general curriculum area. At least half of the publications were dissertations, and the efforts of the doctoral students were among the best in the period. The leaders of the curriculum field were represented, as Leonard Koos (1920, 1927, 1934) staked out the area of the secondary curriculum while Franklin Bobbitt examined the use of the activity analysis technique in constructing the curriculum (1922, 1926). Harap (1930, 1932, 1935) collected data on the new courses of study produced during the revision movement, while Wrightstone (1934, 1936, 1938) led a variety of experiments at both the elementary and high school levels. Hopkins (1933, 1934), Judd (1927), Courtis (1927), Counts (1926, 1927), and Bagley (1926) contributed publications, and outstanding works were presented by Washburne (1926), Collings (1926), Bruner (1925), and Stratemeyer and Bruner (1926). Three large-scale studies were products of the period, as the government sponsored a massive survey of secondary education (Koos, 1934), the Progressive Education Association monitored innovations in the high school curriculum (Aiken, 1942), and a number of educators including McCall, Wrightstone, Thorndike and Morrison worked with the New York City longitudinal experiment on the activity curriculum (Morrison, 1942).[3]

The effort which curriculum workers put into gathering data did not match the time and energy expended on theoretical works or on the improvement of school practice in the field, but this first generation did concern themselves with the application of research in the curriculum field. Stratemeyer and Bruner (1926) and Ullrich (1937), for example, sought to determine current beliefs on the statement of goals and objectives in a curriculum plan, and with Koos (1924), Proctor and Brown (1928) and Rowland (1933) provided evidence on the goals of education accepted by schoolmen. Cox, Peters, and Snedden (1929) likewise focused on descriptions of current practice as they examined the use of the activity analysis technique in determining goals and objectives. The scientific method was employed to assess the effectiveness of innovations in curriculum design, to document changes in the elementary and secondary curriculums, to ascertain the role of certain groups in the curriculum planning process, and to aid in actual curriculum construction. One of the most successful roles assigned to the research process was illustrated in the numerous publications which detailed the growth, rationale, characteristics, and effectiveness of the junior high school and curriculum revision movements. Few of these fifty-one studies were outstanding in and of themselves, but taken as a whole they traced the development and impact of two important movements in the curriculum field.[4]

There is little doubt than many of the 137 publications on the general curriculum were eminently forgettable, but each area of research was represented, as well, by some outstanding efforts. In 1925 Flanders initiated a line of inquiry focused on the extent to which state legislatures dictated the elementary course of study. His method of searching constitutional and statuatory laws in force in each state was duplicated by authors through the 1950s, and was extended by Patty (1925), Troxel (1926), and Andrews (1938) to include the secondary course of study. Related to Flander's dissertation was a whole series of publications designed to determine the legal basis for state legislature prescription of the curriculum, and a somewhat smaller group of studies focused on the influence of lay pressure groups on this state legislature process. A similar scenario occurred with John Stout's (1921) dissertation on the development of the high school curriculum in the North Central States from 1860 to 1918. A number of independent investigations confirmed Stout's preliminary conclusions on the expansion of the secondary course of study, and the National Survey of Secondary Education (Koos, 1934), by using the same thirty mid-western high schools examined by Stout, was able to identify trends in the high school curriculum over a seventy year period.

Historical studies also played an important role in the research on the elementary curriculum, as well as the evolution of accepted goals for American education. Carleton Mann (1928), following a tradition begun by Joseph Mayer Rice in 1897, traced the development of the elementary school course of study by examining the time allotted to, and hence emphasis place on, each subject. Like Stout (1921), he noted a gradual expansion of the course of study, with some stabilization occurring by 1927. His view of the standard elementary curriculum of that time was confirmed by Norton (1924), Ayer (1924), Glass (1924), and Judd (1927), as was his conclusion that there was a complete lack of uniformity as to the particulars of what was taught, when, for how long, and when it was begun. Rowland (1933) examined state constitutions, state school laws, state courses to study, and reports from state, county, and city superintendents as he searched for the accepted goals of American education from colonial days to 1933. He identified seven goal areas for the public schools, including religious, moral and ethical, formal (fundamental processes), vocational - utilitarian, citizenship - nationalism, health, cultural, and miscellaneous aims. All but the religious aims were still popular in 1933, and he noted that there had been a gradual expansion of the accepted role of the school in American society from colonial days through 1933.

Some of the outstanding studies produced between 1918 and 1938 remained isolated experiments, though their value to serve as models

for future research has in no way been diminished by the passage of time. In 1925, for example, Herbert Bruner presented a detailed case study of a curriculum in a single junior high school. With its leisure activity period and broadening and finding courses, Bruner's junior high school bears a striking resemblance to the ideal middle school described today. Just one year later, with Florence Stratemeyer, Bruner supervised the development of a whole series of forms designed to rate elementary courses of study. Based on the opinions of over 100 expert judges, the rating forms reflected the best of contemporary curriculum theory. Yet to be surpassed are the design studies of Carleton Washburne and Ellsworth Collings, both published in 1926. Located in the small suburban town of Winnetka, Illinois, Washburne led the development of a specific competencies approach to education which featured self-paced individualized instruction. Collings launched his five year longitudinal experiment in a one-room rural school in McDonald County, Missouri, with an activity curriculum composed of story, handwork, play, and excursion projects. Like the Winnetka children, Collings' students exceeded the achievement levels attained by pupils in a traditional subject-discipline curriculum. Both studies met the highest defined standards of research for their time, a feat which subsequent authors during this period failed to match.[5]

Despite the presence of these outstanding studies, and the productivity which characterized this twenty year period, contemporary writers held a rather pessimistic view of the contributions made by research to the curriculum field. Characteristic of this attitude was Hollis Caswell's review in the 1935 AERA Official Report, in which he attempted to summarize changes which would be made in elementary education if research findings to date should be implemented. "If the curriculum worker," he wrote, "is willing to accept and employ findings from studies of current practice and consensus, and hold that in so doing, the curriculum is based on scientific evidence, there are certain phases of curriculum making that may be modified significantly. But if the curriculum worker is looking for findings that are verified experimentally or which have been arrived at from extensive trials with children and measures of achievement, there are few changes indeed that may be made on this basis (Caswell, 1935, pp. 160-161). The inability to identify definite research results was highlighted just three years later by Peik's (1938) analysis of "A Generation of Research on the Curriculum" for the Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. He was able to list just three broad, rather than specific, accomplishments of twenty years of research; the development of a more critical attitude on the part of curriculum workers rather than total acceptance of current practice; encouragement of more reflective thinking on the curriculum; and a reconsideration of the bases of education in terms of social values and social progress. For a field which had believed science would be able to determine the one "best" curriculum, such summaries of research must have been disappointing indeed.

The failure of research to effect change in theory and practice was due in part to the fragmentary and isolated nature of some of the studies. The effect of the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, for example, proved to be a fascinating topic but it was pursued by only a single study (Proctor and Brown, 1928). Then, too, many of the researchers seemed to be totally unaware of any previous work done in their area, resulting in a lack of continuity and iability to profit from past experience. Doctoral dissertations tended to lay on dusty library shelves, forgotten and unresurrected by even their own authors. Though they were generally published by the university awarding the degree, the results of these often excellent studies seldom made it into journals for further dissemination. The term research was bandied about and used to refer to purely descriptive and sometimes trivial accounts of what was going on in some department of some school, a practice which Rugg warned in 1926 would lead to a certain complacence and consequent neglect of real research. The development of what Walter Monroe (1928) called a pseudo simplistic faith about the research process -- a belief that the technique required for research into education problems was relatively simple and could be engaged in by any enthusiastic amateur -- resulted in carelessness in design and execution of many of the studies.

It was the virtual lack of an attempt to summarize and evaluate the results of the 137 studies, however, that limited the contributions which research could make to the curriculum field. For even by the standards of the current generation, there are principles which can be identified from this early research on the general curriculum. In the area of the goals of education, the detailed information provided by Rowland (1933), when combined with results obtained by Stratemeyer and Bruner (1926), Koos (1924), Proctor and Brown (1928), and Ulrich (1937) led to this conclusion:

> By 1938 educational and state leaders accepted and set goals for American schools in six areas: moral and ethical training; training in the formal and fundamental processes; vocational-utilitarian education; development of citizenship-nationalism; attention to health; and development of culture. Though some earlier stated aims of education were no longer popular, a general pattern of the gradual expansion of the role of the school from colonial days through 1938 was evident.

Then, too, the pioneer study by Flanders (1925), augmented by the results of eighteen subsequent publications, left little doubt about the role which state legislatures were playing in prescribing the course of study:

> State legislatures had the legal right to prescribe the curriculum content of the public schools, and they exercised this right at both the elementary and secondary levels. There was a gradual increase in the number of prescriptions stated in the general areas of nationalism, health and prohibition, conservation of life and property, practical and cultural subjects, humaneness, fundamental subjects, religious and ethical studies, and miscellaneous subjects. Organized lay pressure groups were successful in having a number of special prescriptions favorable to their cause enacted by state legislatures.

Surveys of current practice also proved to be valuable when replicated in sufficient quantity, particularly with respect to the junior high school and curriculum revision movements. Though some aspects of each of these research areas were not developed in sufficient depth to allow conclusions to be drawn, it was possible to state these generalizations:

> The junior high school organization spread rapidly across the country, and be 1937, 45 percent of all secondary school students attended a reorganized system.
>
> The new junior high schools found it difficult to fulfill their special purposes of encouraging economy of time and retention of students, providing differentiated curricula and guidance programs, and attending to individual differences.
>
> A nationwide curriculum revision movement led and sponsored by the education profession occurred at both the elementary and secondary levels between 1918 and 1938. The basic organization of the public schools, despite such revision efforts, remained the traditional subject-discipline design. The main products of the curriculum revision movement were new courses of study, the majority of which failed to live up to the theoretical ideal of stating both general and specific objectives.

Finally, the elementary and high school courses of study attracted considerable attention from curriculum workers and once again it was the data collected through historical and survey methods which led to these generalizations:

> The elementary curriculum expanded gradually from 1775 to 1926, and by that date most schools included reading, arithmetic, spelling, geography, language, penmanship, music, art, drawing, and opening exercises in their course of study. Approximately 50 percent of the school time was allotted to the 3 R's, with content subjects (history, civics, geography, science) receiving 15 percent and special subjects (hygiene, physical education, music, fine and industrial arts, recess, special exercises) garnering 35 percent of the day. There was, however, a complete lack of uniformity as to the particulars of what was taught, when, for how long, and when it was begun, and no agreement among schools on the time allotted to each individual subject.
>
> Between 1890 and 1935 four trends were apparent in the high school curriculum: a steady growth in the number of curriculums offered, with most additions in the commercial, vocational, industrial, and practical arts areas; a corresponding decrease in the percent of curriculums classified as academic or college preparatory from 50 percent in 1910 to 33 percent in 1935; acceptance of the concept of multiple curriculums, with all but the smallest high schools offering at least three by 1935; and an increase in the average number of subjects offered from 23.7 in 1910 to 48.1 in 1935, with the least expansion in math, foreign languages, and science, and the most additions in English, social studies, physical education, and vocational subjects.

There are, then, procedures, rules, and principles related to various aspects of education that can be derived, as Monroe (1925) suggested, from the research produced by this first generation. And what of the traditions of the curriculum field, the lessons to be learned, or the new perspectives to be gained? It was, first of all, a period of quantity production, though few authors evidenced sustained interest in a single line of inquiry,

and considerably more effort was devoted to the development of theory and improvement of practice than to the conscious pursuit of educational research. Contemporary curriculum specialists proclaimed the benefits of the scientific method, but evidence that at least half of the 137 studies were dissertations and that three-fourths of the writers made only a single research contributions to the general curriculum area presents a somewhat different image of the period. The scientific method was used in a variety of roles, as curriculum workers collected data to identify current practice, to evaluate innovations in the schools, to determine trends in the elementary and secondary curriculums, to aid in actual curriculum construction, to monitor the role of certain groups in the planning process, and to trace the growth and development of contemporary movements. Only a handful of studies however, were designed to test a specific hypothesis, and few theorists employed research as a tool in proving or disproving their concepts of the educational process.

Whether these characteristics are "traditions" in curriculum research must be determined by study of the work of subsequent generations, but the principles derived from this twenty years of research raise some interesting questions. Has the role assigned to the American school, for example, continued to expand through the 1970s, and if so, at what point do these increased responsibilities begin to interfere with the functioning of the institution? Has the number of subjects taught in our schools continued to spiral upward, and if so, what effect does this have on our ability to teach every student the basic skills and knowledge needed for life? Do state legislatures and pressure groups continue to dictate increasing portions of the elementary and secondary courses of study, and if so, what does this imply about the ability of the education profession to lead and direct needed changes in American education? Why did the nationwide curriculum revision movement of the 1920s and 1930s fail to effect substantial change in American schools; what conditions contributed to the inability of the junior high school to meet its special purposes?

More clearly, there are lessons to be learned from the work of this first generation. Certain types of studies proved to be valuable: the historical works presented baseline data needed to judge trends in American schools, while case studies, such as those by Bruner (1925), Collings (1926), and Washburne (1926), documented attempts at innovation in sufficient detail to allow for replication. Surveys of current status provided important data to the historian relative to the growth and development of significant movements in the curriculum field. The need to pursue a line of inquiry beyond a single study was illustrated, as was the advantage to be gained by relating one's work to previous publications in the field. The most important lesson to learned, however, was the necessity of summarizing and evaluating the results of completed research. It is impossible for research to make a significant contribution to theory or school practice if it is not periodically reviewed and disseminated to schoolmen. There is little hope that the curriculum field will ever pursue Monroe's ultimate purpose of educational research unless authors accept responsibility for not only producing studies, but also evaluating the results of bodies of work.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This paper is a much shortened version of a paper intitled, "An Historical Review of Research 1918-1938," given at the 1977 Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History.

[2]Studies reviewed included those which dealt with the goals, designs, planning process and evaluation of the general curriculum. The term 'research' was somewhat loosely used in this period; for this review each 'study' located which was based on some type of data collection was included. Information on the appropriateness, reliability, and validity of the data gathering procedures, sampling design, statistical procedures, and experimental design was recorded. This review was limited to studies involving grades one through twelve, excluded research dealing with a single subject area or focused solely on instructional methods, and relied primarily on published work.

[3]Both the Eight-Year Study and the New York City Experiment were begun in the 1930s, though final results were not published until 1942. Because of the publication date, a discussion of the results of these studies was not included in this review.

[4]The actual breakdown of the studies includes:

Goals - 13

Bobbitt (1926)
Cox, Peters, Snedden (1929)
Dulabohn (1926)
Frederick and Farquar (1937)
Koos (1924)
Lorenzen (1926)
Mietz (1926)
Palmer (1926)
Peters (1929)
Proctor & Brown (1928)
Rowland (1933)
Stratemeyer & Bruner (1926)
Ulrich (1937)

Designs - 22

Bobbitt (1922)
Bruene (1935)
Collings (1926, 1933)
Crawford & Hale (1935)
Gustin (1934)
Hopkins & Mendenhall (1933, 1934)
Howell, Dunn, Stoker (1933)
Lee and Root (1934)
McCall, Chassell, Hollingsworth (1919)
Marlan (1933)
Oberholzer (1937)
Pratt, Dunlap, Cureton (1929)
Reynolds & Fleming (1935)
Tate (1936)
Washburne, Vogel, Gray (1926)
Williams (1930)
Wrightstone (1934, 1936, 1938)

Junior High School - 29

Beatley (1932)
Briggs (1920a, 1920b)
Bruner (1925)
Childs (1927)
Davis (1932)
Davis (1918)
Davis (1936)
Defenbaugh (1923)
Douglas (1935)
Dvorak (1932)
Edgerton (1922)
Fritz (1927)
Glass (1924)
Koos (1920, 1927, 1934)
Landsittel (1928)
Moss (1935)
Mills (1931)
Porter (1924)
Powers (1927)
Pratt (1922)
Rodgers (1921)
Smith (1935)
Spaulding (1927)
Stetson (1917)
Tyler (1937)
Tyron, Smith, Root (1937)

High School - 14

Barrong (1930)
Clem & Klyver (1936)
Clem & Derby (1934)
Douglass (1939)
Ellis (1932)
French (1933)
Geiger (1934)
Good & Good (1927)
Good & Roberts (1928)
Holz (1936)
Killion (1932)
Koos (1934)
Riddle (1937)
Stout (1921)

Elementary School - 7

Ayer (1924)
Bagley & Kyte (1926)
Holmes (1915)
Judd (1927)
Kyte & Lewis (1936)
Mann (1928)
Norton (1924)

Curriculum Revision Movement - 22

Bagley & Kyte (1926)
Bruner (1932)
Cocking (1928)
Counts (1924, 1927)
Courtis (1927)
Flavius (1932)
Harap & Bayne (1932)
Harap (1930, 1935)
Herrick (1916)
Holley (1915)
Holloway (1928)
Langnick (1931)
Leary (1938)
Leonard & Root (1936)
Patterson (1928)
Reinoell (1923)
Sheerer (1937)
Trillingham (1934)
Updegraff (1919)
Walker (1937)

Role of State Legislatures and Pressure Group - 17

Andrews (1938)
Bagley & Kyte (1926)
Donnelly (1926)
Fenton (1932)
Flanders (1925)
Gellerman (1938)
Hamilton (1927)
Halter (1938)
Johnston (1926)
Lide (1930)
Nixon (1932)
Patty (1925)
Pierce (1930)
Raup (1936)
Tanke (1937)
Tidwell (1928)
Underwood (1935)

Evaluation - 5

Anderson (1936)
English (1935)
Erdly (1933)
Romine (1930)
Stratemeyer & Bruner (1926)

[5]Typical problems of subsequent studies in the design area included insufficient description of the experimental and/or control curriculums, and lack of control groups or use of standardized test norms in place of control groups. A few studies also employed non-equivalent control groups. The use of equivalent (though matched) control groups and the importance of adequate descriptions of control and experimental curriculums were established as standards of good research as early as 1921, when Collings began his study.

REFERENCES

Aikin, Wilford M. The Story of the Eight-Year Study. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942).

Anderson, Henry. An Evaluation of the Curriculum by High School Graduates. Masters' Thesis, Iowa State University, 1936.

Andrews, D. F. The Factor of Authority in Determining Curricula and Courses of Study in Secondary Schools as Shown in Legislation. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, 1938.

Ayer, Fred C. Comparative Time Allotments. (Seattle: Seattle Public School Board of Directors, 1924).

Bagley, William C. and George C. Kyte. The California Curriculum Study. (Berkeley, Ca: University of California Printing Office, 1926).

Beatley, Bancroft. Achievement in the Junior High School. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932).

Berk, Leonard. "Learning from the Curricular Past," in What the Curriculum Field Needs to Learn from its History. Proceedings, Symposium, American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 1978.

Barrong, Marvin T. "A Curriculum Study of the Public High Schools of Georgia," Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1930.

Bobbitt, J. Franklin. The Curriculum. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1918).

Bobbitt, J. Franklin. Curriculum Investigations. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1926).

Bobbitt, J. Franklin. Curriculum-Making in Los Angeles. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1922).

Briggs, Thomas H. "Comparative Results in Intermediate and Elementary Schools at Los Angeles," Journal of Educational Research, 2, 681-692 (November 1920a).

Briggs, Thomas H. The Junior High School. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920b).

Bruene, Elizabeth. "The Activity Procedure and the Fundamentals," California Journal of Elementary Education, 4, 104-108 (November, 1935).

Bruner, Herbert B. The Junior High School as Work. (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925).

Bruner, Herbert B. "The Present Status of Curriculum Construction for the Elementary School in the United States," North Central Association Quarterly, 6, 399-407 (March 1932).

Caswell, Hollis L., "What Changes in Elementary Education Curriculum Would Be Effected if Research Findings to Date Were Actually Applied?" in American Educational Research Association Official Report, The Application of Research Findings to Current Educational Practices. (Washington, D.C.: AERA, 1935), pp. 156-161.

Childs, H. G. "An Investigation of Certain Phases of the Reorganization Movement in the Grammar Grades of Indiana Public Schools," in Leonard V. Koos, The Junior High School. (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1927), 2nd Ed.

Clem, Orlie M. and Orlo L. Derby. "Are Curriculum Practices of Small High Schools Practical?" Nation's Schools. 13, 39-42 (March 1934).

Clem, Orlie M. and Richard Klyver. "Curriculum Practices in the Six-Year Secondary School," School and Society. 44, 62-64 (July 1936).

Cocking, Walter D. Administrative Procedures in Curriculum Making for Public Schools. (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928).

Collings, Ellsworth. An Experiment with a Project Curriculum. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926)

Collings, Ellsworth. "Learning the Fundamentals in the Activity Curriculum," Journal of Experimental Education, 1, 309-319 (June 1933).

Counts, George S. "Current Practices in Curriculum-Making in Public High Schools," in National Society for the Study of Education. Twenty-sixth Yearbook. Part I, The Foundations and Techniques of Curriculum Construction. (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1927), pp. 135-162.

Counts, George S. The Senior High School Curriculum. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1926).

Courtis, Stuart A. "Current Practices in Curriculum-Revision in Public Elementary Schools," in National Society for the Study of Education. Twenty-sixth Yearbook. Part I, The Foundations and Techniques of Curriculum Construction. (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1927), pp. 119-134.

Cox, Phillip, Charles C. Peters, and David Snedden. "Objectives in Education," in National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology. Second Yearbook, Objectives of Education. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929).

Craig, Geraldine S. Certain Techniques Used in Developing a Course of Study in Science for the Horace Mann Elementary School. (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927).

Crawford, C. C. and Verna L. Hale. "Results of an Activity Program in a Small School," School and Society. 41, 718-720 (May 25, 1935).

Cushman, C. L. and Guy Fox. "Research and the Public-School Curriculum," in National Society for the Study of Education. Thirty-seventh Yearbook. Part II. The Scientific Movement in Education. (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 67-68.

Davis, Burton E. "Exploratory and Guidance Functions of the Junior High School," California Quarterly of Secondary Education. 8, 39-46 (October 1932).

Davis, Calvin O. "Junior High Schools in the North Central Association Territory, 1917-1918," School Review. 26, 324-336 (May 1918).

Davis, Calvin O. "Today's Junior High, Curricular Trends in Twenty-five Schools," Nation's Schools. 17, 37-39 (June 1936).

Deffenbaugh, Walter S. Specimen Junior High School Program of Studies, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1923, No. 21. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1923).

Donnelly, C. A. "Expressions of National Non-Educational Organizations Regarding Public Education," Masters' Thesis, University of California, 1926.

Douglass, Aubrey A. "Developments in California High Schools," Educational Record. 20, 44-59 (January 1939).

Douglass, Harl R. "Some Trends in the Junior High School Curriculum," Nation's Schools. 16, 33-34 (August 1935).

Dulebohn, Iri H.. "Civic and Social Shortcomings as Curriculum Indices," in J. Franklin Bobbitt, Curriculum Investigations. (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 1926), pp. 69-87.

Dvorak, August. "Recognition of Individual Differences in the Junior High School," School Review. 30, 679-685 (November 1922).

Edgerton, Alonson H. "Present Status of Guidance Activities in Junior High School," Education. 43, 173-183 (November 1922).

Ellis, Emmett. An Evaluation of State Programs of Secondary Education. (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1932).

English, William L. "The Relative Value of Various High School Courses to Employed Adults of Tucson, Arizona," Masters' Thesis, Arizona State University, 1935.

Erdly, Calvin V. "Reshaping a High School Curriculum and Instructional Organization on Basis of Graduates' Comments," Masters' Thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1933.

Fenton, Frederick C. "The Legal Basis for the Elementary School Curriculum," Masters' Thesis, University of Chicago, 1932.

Flanders, J. K. Legislative Control of the Elementary Curriculum. (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925).

Flavius, Louis D. The Selection and Organization of Personnel for Curriculum Revision. (Cleveland, Ohio: Curriculum Laboratory, School of Education Western Reserve University, 1932), No. 30.

Franke, Paul R. "Changing Tendencies in Educational Research," Masters' Thesis, University of Colorado, 1930.

Frederick, O. I. and Lucile J. Farquer. "Areas of Human Activity," Journal of Educational Research. 30, 672-679 (May 1937).

Freeman, Frank N. "Introduction," in National Society for the Study of Education. Thirty-seventh Yearbook. Part II., The Scientific Movement in Education. (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1938), pp. 1-5.

French, Will. "Curriculum Practices in High School," School Executives Magazine. 52, 387-389 (August 1933).

Fritz, Ralph A., An Evaluation of Two Special Purposes of Junior High School: Economy of Time and Bridging the Gap, University of Iowa Studies in Education, Vol. IV, No. 5 (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1927).

Geiger, Albert J. The Six-Year High School. (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1934).

Gellermen, W. The American Legion as Educator. (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938).

Glass, James M. Curriculum Practices in the Junior High School and Grades 5 and 6. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1924).

Good, Carter V. and Edward D. Roberts, "Curriculum Titles and Curriculum Constants in Senior High Schools," School Review. 36, 679-684 (November 1928).

Good, Carter V. and Raymond E. Good. "Curriculum Titles and Curriculum Constants in Senior High Schools," School Review. 35, 503-509 (September 1927).

Gustin, Margaret and Hayes, M. L. Activities in the Public School. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1934).

Halter, H. The Educational Programs of Selected Taxpayer's Association and Their Influence on Public Education. Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1938.

Hamilton, Otto T. The Courts and the Curriculum. Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Harap, Henry and Alice J. Bayne. "A Critical Survey of Public School Courses of Study Published 1929-1931," Journal of Educational Research. 28, 46-55, 105-109 (October 1932).

Harap, Henry. "A Critique of Public School Courses of Study 1928-29," Journal of Educational Research. 28, 641-656 (May 1935).

Hernick, Michael E. "High School Curriculum-Making Procedures in Maryland," Masters' Thesis, Duke University, 1938.

Herrick, Cheesman A. "What High-School Studies Are of Most Worth?" School and Society. 4, 305-309 (August 26, 1916).

Holley, Charles E. "Curriculum Differentiation and Administration in Typical High Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision. 1, 332-340 (May 1915).

Holloway, William J. Participation in Curriculum Making as a Means of Supervision in Rural Schools, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928).

Holmes, Henry W. "Time Distributions by Subjects and Grades in Representative Cities," in National Society for the Study of Education. Fourteenth Yearbook, Part I, Minimum Essentials in Elementary-School Subjects — Standards and Current Practices, (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1915), pp. 21-27.

Holz, H. G. "Trends in the Development of Secondary Schools," North Central Association Quarterly, 10, 287-297 (January 1936).

Hopkins, L. Thomas and James E. Mendenhall. Achievement at Lincoln School, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934).

Hopkins, L. Thomas. "Learning Essentials in an Activity Curriculum," Journal of Experimental Education, 1, 298-303 (June 1933).

Howell, Etta, Maude Wilson Dunn, and Dora Stoker. "Measuring the Skills in an Integrated Program," Journal of Experimental Education, 1, 316-319 (June 1933).

Johnston, L. R. Legal Rights and Powers of Agencies Involved in the Determination of the Public School Curriculum, Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1936.

Judd, Charles H. Report of the Commission on Length of Elementary Education, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1927).

Kemmerer, W. W. "Evaluation of the Integrated Curriculum," in National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, 1934, (Washington, D. C.: The NEA, 1934), pp. 375-376.

Killion, J. Errett. "Provisions for Differentiated Curricula in Senior and Four-Year High Schools in California," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 7, 178-181 (January 1932).

Kilpatrick, William H. "The Project Method," Teachers College Record, 19, 319-335 (September 1918).

Koos, Leonard V. "Comparison of Aims from Elementary School to University," Educational Review. 69, 176-183 (April 1925).

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior High School. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, Inc., 1927).

Koos, Leonard V. "The Peculiar Functions of the Junior High School: Their Relative Importance," School Review, 28, 673-681 (November 1920).

Koos, Leonard V. Summary. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 17 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1934).

Kyte, George C. and Robert H. Lewis. "Time Tables, Sixty-Three School Systems Report Time Allotted to Elementary Subjects," Nation's Schools, 17, 23-25 (January 1936).

Landsittel, F. C. "Scholastic Accomplishment in the Junior High School," Journal of Educational Research, 18, 127-135 (September 1928).

Langvick, Nina M. Current Practices in the Construction of State Courses of Study, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1931, No. 4 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1931).

Leary, Bernice E. A Survey of Courses of Study and Other Curriculum Materials Published Since 1934, U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1937, No. 31 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938).

Lee, J. Murray and E. Raymond Root. "An Experiment in Integration," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 9, 247-255 (April 1934).

Leonard, J. Paul and Alvin C. Eurich. An Evaluation of Modern Education, (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1942).

Leonard, J. Paul, "Teacher Participation in Recent State Curriculum Programs," Journal of Education Research, 29, 117-126 (October 1935).

Lorenzen, Clara H. "Approved Social Behavior" in J. Franklin Bobbitt, Curriculum Investigations, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1926), pp. 103-109.

Lide, Edwin S. Legal Basis of the Organization, Support, and Control of City Schools, Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1930.

McCall, W. A., Clara F. Chessell, and Leta S. Hollingsworth, "Experimental Measurements," Teachers College Record, 20, 218-228 (May 1919).

McKim, Margaret G. "Curriculum Research in Historical Perspective," in Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1957 Yearbook, Research for Curriculum Development, (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1957), pp. 14-40.

Mann, Carleton H. How Schools Use Their Time 1826-1926, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928).

Meriam, Junius L. "An Activity Curriculum in a School of Mexican Children," Journal of Experimental Education, 1, 304-308 (June 1933).

Mills, H. C. The Comparative Efficiency of the 8-4 and 6-3-3 Systems of Schools, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1931.

Monroe, Walter S. and Neil Bomar Johnston. Reporting Educational Research. (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1923).

Monroe, Walter S. Ten Years of Educational Research, (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1928).

Moss, Theodore C. Core Curriculum Programs in New York State Junior High Schools and Their Implications for Teacher Education, Doctoral dissertation, University of Buffalo, 1935.

National Education Association. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1918, No. 35., (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1918).

National Society for the Study of Education. Thirty-seventh yearbook Part II, The Scientific Movement in Education, (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1938).

Nietz, John A. "Traits of a Good Citizen," in J. Franklin Bobbitt, Curriculum Investigations, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1926), pp. 54-69.

Nixon, O. Floyd. A Critical Study of Curriculum Legislation with Special Reference to Ohio from 1883 to 1931, Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1932.

Norton, John K. "A General Survey of the Curriculum Situation," Journal of Educational Research, 10, 149-153 (September, 1924).

Oberholtzer, Edison E. An Integrated Curriculum in Practice, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).

Palmer, Paul L. "Major Fields of Human Concern: The Evidence from the Literary Digest," in J. Franklin Bobbitt, Curriculum Investigations, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 1926), pp. 40-55.

Patterson, John W. The Organization and Administration of a Program for Curriculum Revision, Unpublished manuscript, University of Oklahoma, 1928.

61

Petty, W. W. The Legal Basis of Secondary Education in the United States, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1925.

Polk, William E. "A Generation of Research on the Curriculum," in National Society for the Study of Education. Thirty-seventh Yearbook, Part II, The Scientific Movement in Education, (Bloomington, Illinois: The Public School Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 53-67.

Peters, Charles C. "The Objectives of Education for Worthy Home Membership," in National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology, Second Yearbook, Objectives of Education, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929), pp. 136-147.

Pierce, B. L. Civic Attitudes in American School Textbooks, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930.)

Porter, William A. "A Comparative Study of Scholastic Achievements Made by Junior and Non-Junior High School Pupils in Minneapolis," Masters' Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1924).

Powers, J. Orin. Instructional Outcomes in Junior High Schools, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1927).

Pratt, Helen G., and Jack W. Dunlap, Edward E. Cureton, "The Subject-Matter Progress of Three Activity Schools in Hawaii," Journal of Educational Psychology, 20, 494-500, (October 1979).

Pratt, Orville C. "Status of the Junior High School in Larger Cities," School Review, 30, 663-70, (Nov 1922)

Proctor, William M. and Edwin J. Brown. "College Admission Requirements in Relation to Curriculum Revision in Secondary Schools," in National Education Association, Department of Superintendence. Sixth Yearbook, The Development of the High School Curriculum, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1928).

Raup, Bruce. Education and Organized Interests in America, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1936).

Reinoehl, Charles M. Analytical Survey of State Courses of Study for Rural Elementary Schools, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1922, No. 42, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1923).

Reynolds, Rollo G. and Cecile White Fleming. "The Evaluation of the Horace Mann Program," Teachers College Record, 36, 699-709, (May 1935).

Riddle, John I. The Six-Year Rural High School, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).

Rodgers, J. Harvey. "Junior High School Curricula and Programs," School Review, 29, 198-205, (March 1921).

Romine, William R. An Appraisal of Study for Secondary Schools, Masters' thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930.

Rowland, William T. Aims of Public Education in the United States, (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1933).

Shearer, Allen E. Procedures in Curriculum Revision Programs of Selected States, (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937).

Shores, J. Harlan. A Critical Review of the Research on Elementary School Curriculum Organization, 1900-1949, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1949).

Smith, Eugene R. and Ralph W. Tyler. Appraising and Recording Student Progress, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942).

Smith, Guy M. Legislative and Judicial Determination of the Public School Curriculum, Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1947.

Smith, Harry P. "The Relative Efficiency of the Junior High School vs. the Conventional Eight-Grade Type of School," Journal of Educational Research, 29, 276-280.

Spaulding, Francis T. The Small Junior High School, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927).

Stetson, Paul. "A Statistical Study of the Scholastic Records of 404 Junior and Non-Junior High School Students," School Review, 25, 617-636, (November 1917).

Stout, John E. The Development of High-School Curricula in the North Central States from 1860-1918, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1921).

Stratemeyer, Florence B. and Herbert B. Bruner. Rating Elementary School Courses of Study, (New York City: Teachers College of Publications, 1926).

Tate, Harry L. "An Evaluation of the Project Method," Elementary School Journal, 37, 122-132, (October 1936).

Tidwell, Clyde J. State Control of Textbooks, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928).

Trillingham, Clinton C. The Organization and Administration of Curriculum Programs, (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1934).

Troxel, O. L. State Control of Secondary Education, Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1926.

Tyler, Laura, "Junior-High Curriculum Revision," Clearing House, 11, 215, 219, (May 1937).

Tyron, R. M., H. L. Smith, and Allan F. Rood. "The Program of Studies in Seventy-eight Junior-High-School Centers," School Review, 35, 96-107. (February 1927).

Ulrich, Felix. The Importance and Functions of Educational Aims and Objectives in Public School Curriculum Construction, Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1937.

Underwood, Clarence. Constitution and Legislative Sanctions for Elementary and Secondary Free Schools in West Virginia, Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1935.

Updegraff, Harlan. "Administrative Cooperation in the Making of Courses of Study in Elementary Schools," in National Education Association, Proceedings and Addresses, 1919, (Washington, D. C.: The NEA, 1919), pp. 675-716.

Walker, A. A. "A Comparative Study of State Organizations for Curriculum Study in the Southern States," Masters' Thesis, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1937.

Washburne, Carleton, Mabel Vogel, and William S. Gray. Results of Practical Experiments in Fitting Schools to Individuals -- A Survey of the Winnetka Public Schools, (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926).

Williams, Herbert D. "An Experiment in Self-Directed Education," School and Society, 31, 715-718, (May 24, 1930).

Wrightstone, Jacob W. "Achievement in Conventional and Progressive Public Schools," Progressive Education, 13, 389-395, (October 1934).

Wrightstone, Jacob W. Appraisal of Experimental High School Practices, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936).

Wrightstone, Jacob W. Appraisal of Newer Elementary School Practices, (New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938).

RICHMOND AND BERKELEY: PARADIGMS FOR CURRICULUM INNOVATION AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

Murry R. Nelson
Pennsylvania State University

and
H. Wells Singleton
University of Toledo

These papers, offered as a single presentation, will focus on the unique and far-sighted curricular ideas that the Richmond, Indiana, and Berkeley, California, schools devised or fostered. The two are linked by (and our research grew out from) an interest in the initial curricular patterns of junior high schools. Berkeley and Richmond were two of the earliest districts to have a junior high school, although only Berkeley's ideas seem to have been widely disseminated. This was largely due to the presence of Frank Bunker, superintendent of the Berkeley Schools for many years and one of the most well known schoolmen of the time. Bunker was quite concerned with the most efficient education that a school could provide, and he saw his Berkeley plan as an opportunity to implement such efficiency through system wide reorganization.

Bunker was well respected and widely disseminated the results of his "experiments" in Berkeley. In one sense, the curriculum of Berkeley, can be said to have derived its the Berkeley Schools consisted of departmentalization, a choice of four languages, vocational arts, and courses specifically geared to the geographic area. This latter concern, reflected in "Pacific Coast Problems" was one of the first regional courses in social studies at any grade level.

Bunker's publicizing of the Berkeley school plan brought the district great recognition and a number of districts used the plan as a model.

By contrast, the Richmond, Indiana, program received little or no publicity even within Indiana. This did not deter the Richmond administration and school board from providing their constituents with some of the most unique curriculum practices of that time.

Richmond pioneered the junior high school in the late 1890s, and by 1900 the Garfield Junior High was a smoothly functioning component of the Richmond schools. The curriculum as evidenced by school reports is quite detailed, and this valuable data will be useful to those trying to find what was actually being taught in schools.

In addition, the Richmond school reports reveal a district operating in geographic isolation but not accepting that "fate." In the late 1890s a normal school was established by the district for the uniform training of teachers, a proposal now being pursued by teachers unions. A university extension center was established in 1897 with the cooperation of the University of Chicago, over 250 miles away!

In summation, our paper focuses on the unique curricula of two innovative districts as well as the utilization of various primary resource material on curriculum at the turn of the century. Both process and product should be of use and interest to those in curriculum history.

School authorities have been in general agreement on two issues regarding the junior high school: that by creating a separate unit, overcrowding in the senior high school is relieved; the adolescent years are difficult years and everyone including the adolescent, could benefit from the operation of a separate junior high school unit.

School authorities tend to disagree however, on what to include in the curriculum and how best to implement the program in the junior high school. That the curricular issue has plagued educators is evidenced by an examination of several surveys beginning with the Berkeley Plan in 1909.

Frank Bunker, superintendent of the Berkely system in 1909, is generally credited with inaugurating the first junior high school in the nation. While Bunker's motive in establishing a junior high school evolved primarily out of an economic need, he did set forth some interesting ideas for the curriculum of the junior high school:

> In contrast to the work of the first six years, I should wish to see the work of this group made exceedingly rich in content and variety, and particularly in human interest. I should hope as far away as possible from that which is purely academic in education. I should wish much emphasis placed on learning how to study, how to use the library, and how to get materials

> from the same with expedition and with judgement. (Board of Education Minutes, 1909).

Bunker looked on the curriculum of the junior high school as transitional in nature. He was mindful of the development adolescent's concern with personal fulfillment, caught between independence and dependence. Bunker perhaps more than most, recognized the need for a curriculum which could ease the elementary child into the high school. The differences between the high school curriculum and Bunker's proposed curriculum were distinct and involved teacher training and perceptions of roles. While both curriculums were fundamentally concerned with preparation for adult life each was preparing for a much different set of circumstances. The elementary curriculum was aimed at the fundamentals of reading, writing and arithmetic. Children were to be taught by compassionate, child oriented teachers in self-contained classrooms. The eight years in elementary programs offered ample opportunity for the child to develop fully in the basic areas and high school. Bunker, among others, recognized that the transition was much too abrupt. The assumption that all adolescents were ready to move from the child centered, self contained, somewhat sheltered, atmosphere to one of many options, discipline centered, and with the teacher as scholar was obviously too difficult for some. There was also a growing feeling that the elementary curricoulum was "padded" with eight years devoted to accomplishing what many felt ought to be done in six.

By freeing up the three intermediate grades the elementary program could be strengthened and the curriculum could be aimed at six years of preparation. The proposed transitional program would not be as stringent as eight years of preparation (much of which apparently took place during the eighth year!).

The transitional program would provide opportunities for multiple offerings and to develop a sense of responsibility among the students as they began to select programs of study in a limited setting. In setting the stage for his junior high school curriculum, Bunker stated:

> To force all children in the seventh and eighth grades, at a time when they are entering a period of school work which should be characterized by very different ideals and goals for those which obtain in the first division, to take the same work is clearly wrong. Uniformity is a curse under which the schools have too long been laboring, and should never be insisted upon beyond that period in which the "tools" of an education are given. (Bunker, 1916, p. 110)

Such a curriculum would require a departmentalized approach; a problem most elementary school districts were unprepared to meet. Bunker was aiming for a curriculum with varying degrees of flexibility in order to ease the pains of adjustment for adolescents entering the subject centered high school curriculum. He addressed the curriculum issue several times as he advocated ". . . that a survey of the chief departments of human knowledge be made before the individual settles down to an intensive study of lives which are intended to comerge toward his future specialty" (Bunker, 1916, p. 146). The general program of studies he sought was to be, according to Bunker, ". . . extensive and popular rather than intensive and narrowly scholarly" so that such a curriculum would harmonize ". . . completely with the natural impulses of those entering the period of adolescence which demands change, variety, and human interest rather than completeness and logical arrangement" (Bunker, 1916, p. 146).

The curriculum focus was to be two-fold; to inspire and provide a transition for those intending to continue their studies beyond the ninth grade and to provide a logical ending point for those who intended to cease their formal schooling at the conclusion of the ninth grade. Both objectives would be difficult to meet as separate ideas and to combine them would require significant changes in the scope of the curriculum.

The curriculum Bunker envisioned posed problems for school officials and perhaps the most difficult to solve was one of staffing. Bunker was clear in his feeling about the kind of teachers the junior high school should employ in order to maximize the idea of a transitional curriculum. He wanted teachers whose internalized orientation to the school process would not clash with the necessary psycho-social orientation of his junior high school. The assignment of a high school teacher to the middle school, he feared, would result in such a conflict in professional valuations of junior high school objects:

> The point of view of such teachers tends to be that . . . the subject and its contents are of paramount importance, after overshadowing interest in the pupil himself. . . By subjecting teachers for the lower high school who first of all have had successful experience in teaching in the grades, and who in the second place have taken enough advanced academic work to broaden their horizon somewhat beyond that of the grade teacher, the ideal combination is secured. Further-

> more, by insisting that such teachers be assigned at least two different subjects rather than one, as often obtains in the larger high schools, the tendency toward undue specialization in those early years can be checked (Bunker, 1916, pp. 106-107).

McKinley elementary school became the first and for a time, the only, school in Berkeley to house the junior high school programs. The selection of McKinley was a natural one due mainly to its existing curriculum and staffing. As early as 1901, McKinley under the principalship of Charles L. Biedenbach developed a departmental plan which offered a degree of subject master sophistication by the staff who were trained as elementary teachers. The McKinley curriculum had undergone several revisions since 1905 to include offerings in five foreign languages, mechanical drawing, free hand courses ". . . which were far in advance of those of the traditional grammar school" (Preston, 1920, p. 41), and both vocal and instrumental music. The schedule of offerings was flexible with some being taught before the regular school day while others were offered after hours. Finally, the seventh, eighth and ninth grades were, from the beginning in 1909, housed as a separate unit. In McKinley, Superintendent Bunker had a good "match" for his idea of a transitional curriculum.

The curriculum placed heavy emphasis on English and to a lesser degree, mathematics in both the seventh and eighth grades. In the ninth grade the English requirement was cut in half while math was dropped as a requirement to be replaced by "World's Work and Pacific Coast Problems" a unique offering found only in the Berkeley program.

Perhaps the significance of the Berkeley plan can be seen in the elective offerings in all three grades. The seven electives were identical at both the seventh and eighth grade levels to include in addition to the foreign languages, printing, typewriting and stenography. As the pupil entered the ninth grade he was confronted with a rather wide array of choices for electives which received greater attention at that level. With thirteen elective offerings, half the pupils' program could be made up of elective offerings. Interestingly, the foreign languages were recycled each year thereby affording the pupil a second opportunity to begin the first year of the language. Those who successfully completed the two years of a foreign language could continue with a third year at the ninth grade level. The curriculum was further enhanced with a policy that permitted the accumulation of course beyond the minimal requirement for grammar school graduation, to be applied toward high school graduation. The high degree of flexibility was developed through a wide range of options within the curriculum; even to the point of permitting substitutions of optional courses for some of the English requirements.

As a result of the flexible curriculum it was anticipated that more students would choose to stay in school beyond the eighth or ninth grade.

• • •

Richmond's junior high program developed partly as a response to the building of a new high school and a secondary desire to house seventh and eighth grade students together. The reason for this was stated by Justin Study, Superintendent of Schools:

> . . . by so doing, the other buildings could be devoted entirely to the younger pupils who ought not to be compelled to travers long distances in going to school, while economy would be subserved by consolidation of small schools in the upper grades which a central school would render practicable. (Study, 1887, pp. 56-57)

The movement towards implementing this new concept was gradual but steadily progressive. By 1891 the eighth grade students were consolidated within the school and the "experiment" was deemed successful enough to continue. Four years later a new building for the seventh and eighth graders had been erected. The superintendent's report of 1895 noted:

> This building is intended to accomodate the eighth year classes of the whole city, and the work is to conducted upon the departmental plan. For the present the school rooms on the first floor will be occupied by seventh year pupils. (Study, 1896, p. 66).

> The 1897 report of the Richmond City schools gives glowing praise to their new experiment, "The results of this change are seen in the better preparation of the pupils for the work of the high school and, in fact, that a larger percentage of pupils leaving eighth grade go on to high school than under the old plan." (Richmond, 1989, p. 39).

What were these students studying in this new junior high, how was it being presented and how successful was it? Curriculum historians are often thwarted by their search for this information, but the Richmond school reports provide a number of pages that speak directly to the first two issues and, at least

obliquely, to the third.

Course of Study of Richmond Schools (1895)

Reading and Literature

6B-6A - Study of selections from Hawthorne, Irving, Longfellow, Whittier and others

7B - Indiana fifth reader, Sketch of Longfellow, St. Argustines Ladder, Number 38 of Riverside Literature Series

7A - Similar to 7B

8B - Similar to 7B, Hale, "Hiawatha", "Miles Standish", Bryant, Holmes

Language

6B Grammar four periods per week, Composition
6A based on culture and Nature of Grade

7B - Grammar 3, Composition 2, Nature Study of Grade

7A- Grammar 3, Composition 2

8B,A - Grammar 3, Composition 1, Based on Literature and History work of grade

History

6 - General - Children Literature
American - Stories of Pizarro, Cortez, Ancient Civilizations of Sumer, Babylonia, Egypt

7 - General - Centers of Civilizations - Euphrates, Nile, Greece, Italy, Spain, England, Stories of Greece and Rome, Legends of Arthur. Political and Commercial Conditions influencing discovery of America, Crusades, Explorers. History of England, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, James I.

7A- Spirit of unrest in Europe at discovery and exploration of New World (inventions)

8B - 3 periods
I. up to 1600 American - Stresses Geography
II. 1600-1750
III. 1750-1789

8A - Stresses individual reading and reports, traces growth of topics
3 periods
I. 1789-1816
II. 1816-1870
III. 1870-present
Use citizens of Richmond and others who have been participants in events of history or who've made a special study.

Nature Work

6 - Plant Life - Seeds and plants (cf. types of plants); Physiology - muscles, skin, skeleton, (movements); Animals

Geography

6B - Western States, Alaska, West Indies, Mexico, Central America, British, Danish America. Relief forms, Model in Sand, Maps - Coordinate with history

6A - Asia, Africa, Oceania - tie with history, (birth place of five great religions in Asia)

7B - Europe cf. latitude with North American cities, imports, exports, coordinate with history

Physiology and Hygiene

7 Human bones cf. with animal skeletons,
8 dissections to teach muscles and organs, effect of alcohol and narcotics on body nervous system

Math

6 - complete arithmetic - notation and numeration, properties of numbers, decimal fractions, U.S. money, bills and accounts, Troy weight, Avoidupois weight, Linear measure, cubic and square, comprehensive monitary system - franc, mark, dry measure, circular, time measure, application of measure

7 - Latitude and Longitude, %, Profit and Loss, Commission and Brokerage, Insurance, Taxes, Duties and Customs, Stocks, Interest, Partial Payment, Bank Discount, Exchange, Ratio and Proportion

8 - Simple Partnership, Square Route, Concrete geometry, Algebra

Music

6 - Chromatic Scale

7 - triads, 7th chords, intervals

8 - Songs in all minor and major keys

German

Industrial Arts Drawing

Penmanship

Physical Culture

In 1910, the junior high school was moved into the former high school which provided even better facilities for the students. "The

building has its own gymnasium and art department, and has a large shop for the boys' wood work and a department, and has a large shop for the boys' wood work and a department of domestic science for the girls." (Mott, 1913, p. 22).

The innovations that emerged from this creative junior high school were many. The work in the building was departmentalized, a radical departure from K-8 elementary school. Promotions were by subjects not by grades with special teachers for each subject. "This plan puts upon the pupil more responsibility in the matter of individual study than the usual plan of placing one teacher in charge of body of pupils to teach all studies." (Mott, 1913, p. 23)

There was also room for individualization, of a sort, under this design.

> The program of studies is varied so as to provide for the slow pupils, as well as for the exceptionally strong. At the close of the 7B work, pupils who show that they are able to progress more rapidly than the regular classes are put into a special grade, enter high school at the end of the 8B term. Permission to enter this special plan is given only after consultation between the parents and the principal, and after careful consideration of the child's health, habits of life, home duties, etc. (Mott, 1913, p. 190)

Different curricula were available with the difference being in the offering of a foreign language (Latin or German). Most of those who omitted the language work did not, according to Mott, expect to go through the high school.

The Richmond, Indiana, Program for Grades Seven and Eight

The following is the course of study for the Garfield School. The elective course in Latin or German is on the left and the standard or English course is on the right.

7B Latin and German Curr.		7B English Curr.	
Subject	hrs/wk	Subject	hrs/wk
English	5	English	5
Latin or German	5	Composition	5
Arithmetic	5	Arithmetic	5
Geography	5	Geography	5
Music	2	Music	2
Drawing	1	Drawing	1
Woodworking/Sewing	2	Woodworking/ Sewing	2
Physical Training	2	Physical Trng	2

7A Latin and German Curr.		7A English Curr.	
Subject	hrs/wk	Subject	hrs/wk
English	5	English	5
Latin or German	5	Composition	5
Physiology	4	Physiology	4
History	5	History	5
Music	2	Music	2
Drawing	1.5	Drawing	1.5
Woodworking/Sewing	2	Woodworking/ Sewing	2
Physical Training	2	Physical Trng	2

8B Latin and German Curr.		8B English Curr.	
Subject	hrs/wk	Subject	hrs/wk
English	5	English	5
Latin or German	5	Composition	5
Arithmetic	5	Arithmetic	5
History	4	History	4
Music	2	Music	2
Drawing	2	Drawing	2
Woodworking/Cooking	2	Woodworking/ Cooking	2
Physical Training	2	Physical Trng	2

8A Latin and German Curr.		8A English Curr.	
Subject	hrs/wk	Subject	hrs/wk
English	5	English	5
Latin or German	5	Composition	5
Arithmetic	4	Arithmetic	4
Civics	5	Civics	5
Music	2	Music	2
Drawing	2	Drawing	2
Woodworking/Cooking	2	Woodworking/ Cooking	2
Physical Training	2	Physical Trng	2

Norval C. Hieronimus, a teacher in the Garfield School and later principal (from 1900 to 1928) organized a homeroom system in the early 1900's called the Teacher-adviser system. The exact date of implementation is not clear but the model was adopted at least in part by other school systems, one being Seymour, Indiana, in 1931 (Mitchell, 1978). The teacher adviser stayed with the same group of students during their entire junior high school experience though a group was not static since it had students from both grade levels each year.

Despite the apparent lack of widespread publicity for Richmond's junior high school program, there are indications that at least some scholars and schoolmen recognized the contributions of Richmond's endeavor. Herbert G. Childs' study of the reorganizing of grammar grades in Indiana presented seven typical junior high courses of study in Indiana, one of which was that of Richmond (Childs, 1918, p. 39).

It might be hypothesized that a district that had the foresight and creativity to pioneer the junior high school would have been innovative in other areas of the curriculum, teaching and schooling. Such a hypothesis seems justified. In a short, colorful piece contained within the 1913 Richmond School Report, Elsie Marshall describes a history of the Richmond schools. It provides some insight into the development of midwestern

school generally if Marshall's account is accurate. Describing a school for girls started by a Miss Whitworth in 1834, Marshall quotes this advertisement placed in the local paper:

> Instruction given to children and young ladies in orthography, reading, penmanship, English grammar and arithmetic, for $2.00 per quarter. Needlework $2.50. Geography and history, $3.00. Rent and fuel, separate charges equally proportioned to the number of scholars. School hours, 8 to meridian, 1 to 4. (Marshall, 1913, p. 57).

Marshall noted that a 1838 convention of teachers of Richmond and vicinity "must have been the first teachers' association or organization of any kind in the city" and probably one of the earliest in the country. There "the teachers discussed the advantages of using uniform textbooks. Heretofore, the different teachers had used any that they chanced to have, or that the pupils might have." (Marshall, 1913, p. 58)

One of the rare female administrators of the time, Mrs. Jane G. Holcombe, was the Richmond High School principal from 1871 to 1885 where she presided over the first public high school graduation in Richmond in 1871.

In the late 1870's one school building was assigned for bilingual instruction "and all pupils who wished instruction in both English and German were required to attend at that building." (Marshall, 1913, p. 64).

Richmond's successful junior high school program was indicative of the entire system. The high school in 1901-02 was 11.6% of the entire school population which was exceeded only by Anderson in Indiana and was far greater than Indianapolis, Chicago, Toledo, Cleveland and other cities. The Richmond attitude, as evidenced by the 1903 school report, was that the "high school is not just a fitting school for colleges...training for life (should be provided) in this school" (Richmond Public Schools, 1903, p. 30). G. Stanley Hall was then quoted to emphasize this feeling "The teachers of the high school should be teachers of the youth...and not of subjects." This contrasts with the prevelant attitude of secondary school teachers today.

The recommended manner of control of the classroom by teachers is also worth noting because Richmond's guidelines are very farsighted in their approach to discipline.

> The following modes of punishment are strictly forbidden. Sarcastic or contemptuous language, reproof administered under the influence of passion, the imposition of additional lessons as a penalty, striking on the head, striking the hands with a ruler, detention to an unreasonable etc. The following punishments are regarded as unobjectionable: Reproof properly and kindly given, in private or before the school, according to the nature of the offense; deprivation of privileges at recess, etc., reporting to the Superintendent, use of warning and special notices, and when other means have failed, corporal punishment. (Richmond Public Schools, 1903, p. 210)

Two other surprising developments in Richmond's schools were the City Training (Normal) School established in 1895 and the University Extension Center established two years later, both of which were alluded to earlier. Dissatisfied with the number of quality new teachers available to the Richmond schools, the city took matters into its own hands with the opening of the Normal School. Six years later in 1901 it closed "on account of the fact that the number of graduates who were ready to take work in our schools made its existence unnecessary. . ." (Richmond Public Schools, 1903, p. 21) The six years had been quite successful however. "As a result of the work of this department all new teachers who have been employed in our schools during the past seven years have either graduated from this course or have taken two or more years in a college or normal school." (Richmond Public Schools, 1903, p. 21).

The University Extension Center established with the University of Chicago offered weekly lecture series by professors from the university which also furnished a traveling library to the school district. It is unclear to the writers how long the relationship between Richmond and the University was maintained though a more thorough search of the reports might yield such information.

Richmond retained an innovative posture in education into the 1930's under E. C. Cline and William G. Bate who were prolific educational writers. Mitchell noted that "many of the innovations in secondary education were originated in Richmond. E. C. Cline and William G. Bate were progressive and able schoolmen." (Mitchell, 1978).

It would not be difficult to continue to chronicle the origin and development of curricular and teaching practices in Richmond though school reports were issued less and less frequently (every two years, every five years) until they stopped altogether in many districts in the 1930's or 1940's. The point of this paper however was to use Richmond and Berkeley as paradigms for curricular innovation at the turn of the century and for illustrating how city surveys and school reports can be an important source of information for the curriculum researcher.

* * *

The school survey of the Grand Rapids, Michigan, schools in 1910 provides evidence of programs in other cities as examples of curriculums with various degrees of flexibility. The Grand Rapids survey was conducted by such notables as Judd, Bobbitt, Rugg, Counts with the junior high school section written by Calvin Davis of the University of Michigan (Grand Rapids, Board of Education, 1916, p. 13). The Grand Rapids survey brought to light one of the dilemmas which continues to plague junior high school programs today. While the Grand Rapids program espoused the popular desire to provide a curriculum which would appeal to the individual needs of adolescents, the flexibility implied in the desired focus failed to materialize. In short, Grand Rapids implemented a junior high program in which electives were offered to such a limited degree that pupils were denied a true transitional program. The survey found that the junior high program was in name only with little attention being paid to developing the professed flexibility. Heavy emphasis was placed on all the transitional subject offerings and a reluctance to encourage pupil decision making was evidenced by the strict adherence to required courses.

The curriculum was divided in two tracks with six to eight elective offerings in each track at the seventh grade. The number of electives was increased to eleven at the eighth grade while the ninth showed slightly more diversification. Courses such as foreign language, chorus, drawing, and printing were relegated to elective status. Interestingly enough, courses such as art, music, and shop were required offerings.

The rigidity displayed in the curriculum prompted the survey team to chide the Grand Rapids school officials for not going ". . . forward either sufficiently far or sufficiently rapidly." (Grand Rapids School Survey, 1916, p. 242).

The Intermediate School (as junior highs were known in some areas) curriculum in Los Angeles followed the Berkeley plan with few modifications. Los Angeles, by 1912, had a series of nine required offerings and six electives at the seventh year. The elective list was increased to eight during the eighth grade and math was moved from a required to an elective while "History and Civics" was introduced as a required course. By the ninth year it was assumed pupils had gained enough self-discipline and maturity to select three electives from a list of nine offerings to be combined with three required subjects (English, physical training, and music or oral English). The program was supposedly just flexible enough to ease the transition from elementary to high school.

Other districts displayed only minimal options at both the seventh and eighth grades. The Trenton, New Jersey curriculum was divided into categories called academics (required) and shop (electives). The pupil was expected to carry a total of thirty hours of work per week, of which twenty were in the academic realm and ten were to come from the electives or shop (for some reason gym and music were included as part of the shop hours). This procedure was carried on again, with some slight modification, at the eighth grade. The ninth grade curriculum was divided in three tracks, academic, commercial, and industrial. The pupil was expected to select from a list of electives within his track.

The curriculum envisioned by Bunker in 1909 included offerings addressed to both continuing as well as terminal eighth grade students, flexibility to encourage self discipline, to be taught in a transitional setting by teachers trained in elementary education with some subject orientation. That vision as viewed through school surveys and reports, took on various modifications in selected other school districts by 1916. The degree to which school districts adhered to Bunker's original curriculum vision varied according to the interpretation each district chose to accept. Textbook usage, courses of study, teacher training and preparation, values and moral instruction are all areas touched upon in school surveys or reports. They can yield indepth information about a city school system or provide a basis for curricular comparison across a number of school systems. The New York City school report of 1855 offers some truly insightful comments on textbooks and individualization, among other things. Concerning texts the report states:

> There is one evil incident to the great market for school books in the United States, . . . The evil to which reference is made is the rapid and constant increase of books designed for use in schools. . . While our presses are throwing off, almost everyday, some new school book, the majority of them can hardly be said to possess any sterling value and certainly no special claims to favor (New York City, 1855, pp. 66-67).

The New York City report discussed various courses of study as well as characteristics and qualifications of teachers. Despite emphasizing the need for all students to gain knowledge in all areas of the curriculum, there is an interesting comment by S. W. Seton, assistant superintendent of schools:

> The portion of time, however, and the degree of attention to be bestowed upon each (course), should have referece to the circumstances and condition of the individual, to the peculiar profession, trade or occupation for which he may be designed, to his predominant taste or genius and to the general character-

istics of the age and the community in which his lot has been cast. (New York City, 1855, Appendix I, p. 14).

New York City's early reports do not detail curriculum as well as some other cities. Chicago, for example, has a more detailed discussion of course descriptions in its 1874 report which also includes a relatively lengthy discourse on co-education's merits and disadvantages.

The city school reports provide an insightful but often subjective view of the schools but the school surveys which were popular from 1920 into the 1940's offered a more thoroughly objective examination of school practices. The first and most well known of these surveys was the Cleveland School Survey directed by Leonard P. Ayres. His survey team included educators like Charles Judd, Franklin Bobbitt and Walter Jessup, dean of the school of education at the State University of Iowa. Twenty-six volumes were produced by the survey team from 1915 to 1917 and much of the work by team members led to more developed work in their area. For example, Bobbitt wrote and researched What the Schools Teach and Might Teach which clearly influenced his two classic curriculum volumes, The Curriculum and How to Make a Curriculum. Two comments from this volume are worth noting. The first speaks directly to an issue "popular" today, the "basics." "There is an endless and perhaps worldwide controversy as to what constitutes the "essentials" of education; and as to the steps to be taken in the teaching of these essentials." (Bobbitt, 1915, p. 15).

Bobbitt's second comment is noteworthy because it sounds exactly like that of Harold Rugg who taught at Chicago with Bobbitt for four years. Commenting on supplementing history reading Bobbitt said, "It should be biographical, anecdotal, thrilling dramas of human achievement, rich with human interest." (Bobbitt, 1915, p. 104)

A later volume of the survey by Herbert Miller offered suggestions to teachers that, if followed, might have precluded the need for multi-cultural or multiethnic education. Miller stated that, "in order to understand the social and educational problems of the different foreign groups, it is necessary to study their origin and history." (Miller, 1916, p. 54). To aid teachers in this pursuit Miller provided some characteristics of national groups, suggestions on what teachers should learn of them and suggested readings on each group. For example, in discussing Jews Miller suggests that "Every teacher should learn the significance of the 14 (Jewish) holidays that occur during the school year. Some effort should be made to understand what the Talmud deals with." (Miller, 1916, p. 63)

What is the point of what has been a most circuitous route from Richmond and Berkeley Junior High Schools to the Cleveland Survey? There were basically two features in the presentation. First was to illustrate the uniqueness of two school districts just before and after the turn of the century. What they did and why can be illustrative of what many schools did after them due, in large part, to the innovations of Richmond and Berkeley.

The second point related to the question, "How do we know what was going on in schools then?" This is where the school reports and later the school surveys come into play. These neglected volumes can provide a much fuller picture of schooling in this country. It is our hope that these materials will be used more fully by curriculum scholars so that we might better appreciate and understand curriculum problems and development.

REFERENCES

Bobbitt, Franklin, What the Schools Teach and Might Teach. Cleveland, Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation 1915.

Bunker, Frank F. The Junior High School Movement: Its Beginnings (Washington, D.C.: W. F. Roberts Company) 1933.

Bunker, Frank F. Reorganization of the Public School System (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1916, No. 8), 1916.

Childs, Hubert Guy. An Investigation of Certain Phases of the Reorganization Movement in the Grammar Grades of Indiana Public Schools. Fort Wayne Printing Co., Fort Wayne, Indiana, 1918.

Department of Instruction, Twentieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Chicago, Bryant, Walker and Co., 1874.

Douglass, Aubrey A. The Junior High School, The Fiftieth Yearbook of NSSE, Part III, Public School Publishing Co., Bloomington, Ill. 1919.

Grand Rapids Michigan School Survey (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Board of Education), 1916.

Miller, Herbert A. The School and the Immigrant, Cleveland, Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, 1916.

"Minutes of the November 30, 1909 Meeting," Board of Education Minutes, 1909 (Berkeley: Board of Education), 1909.

Mitchell, J. R. Superintendent, Richmond, Indiana Schools, 1940s, and previously a Seymour, Indiana educator. Letter to Edmund Short, 9/2/78.

New York City, Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, New York City, William C. Bryant and Co., 1855.

Preston, James T. Junior High Schools of Berkeley, California (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1923, No. 4), 1923.

Richmond City School Reports, Richmond, Indiana, Nicholson Printing Company, 1895, 1897, 1902, 1913.

FOUNDING MEMBERS

Arthur N. Applebee, National Council of Teachers of English
Arno A. Bellack, Teachers College, Columbia University
Hollis L. Caswell, Teachers College, Columbia University
Lawrence A. Cremin, Teachers College, Columbia University
William Cutler, Temple University
O.L. Davis, Jr., University of Texas, Austin
Arthur W. Foshay, Teachers College, Columbia University
J. Stephen Hazlett, University of Texas, Austin
Hazel Hertzberg, Teachers College, Columbia University
Willard J. Jacobson, Teachers College, Columbia University
Philip W. Jackson, University of Chicago
Gerald W. Jorgenson, John Carroll University
Paul R. Klohr, The Ohio State University
James B. Macdonald, University of North Carolina, Greensboro
George L. Mehaffy, University of Texas, Austin
Alice Miel, Teachers College, Columbia University
Murry R. Nelson, The Pennsylvania State University
Paul J. Ortenzio, Rutgers University
A. Harry Passow, Teachers College, Columbia University
Gerald A. Ponder, North Texas State University
William H. Schubert, University of Illinois, Chicago
Mary Louise Seguel, Northern Illinois University
Steven Selden, University of Pennsylvania
Edmund C. Short, The Pennsylvania State University
H. Wells Singleton, University of Toledo
Douglas Sloan, Teachers College, Columbia University
Kate Strickland, University of Texas, San Antonio
Daniel Tanner, Rutgers University
Laurel N. Tanner, Temple University
Ralph W. Tyler, Science Research Associates
George Willis, University of Rhode Island
Arthur G. Wirth, Washington University
Wayne J. Urban, Georgia State University